

MODERN LANGUAGE

UNIVERSITY
OF MICHIGAN
MAR 11 1953

PERIODICAL
READING ROOM

CONTENTS

	PAGE
LAWLIS, MERRITT E.—Newman on the Imagination,	73
ABEL, DARREL.—Modes of Ethical Sensibility in Hawthorne,	80
LUMIANSKY, R. M.—The Relationship of Lancelot and Guenevere in Malory's "Tale of Lancelot,"	86
ENGELHARDT, G. J.—On the Sequence of Beowulf's 'Georgoð,'	91
LESLIE, J. K.—'Figaro en Lisboa,' an Unpublished Article by Mariano José de Larra,	96
ANDRIAN, G. W.—Early Use of the Lyric Monologue in French Drama of the Seventeenth Century	101
PITOU, SPIRE.—A Battle of Books: Pierre Richelet and Amelot de la Houssaye,	105
RALEIGH, J. H.—"My Brother's Keeper"—Stanislaus Joyce & "Finnegans Wake,"	107
MAGALANER, MARVIN.—Leopold Bloom before 'Ulysses,'	110
FAIN, J. T.—"New Poems" of Emily Dickinson,	112
REECE, J. B.—New Light on Poe's "The Masque of the Red Death,"	114
FURNISS, W. T.—Gascoigne and Chaucer's 'Pesen,'	115
WOOLF, H. B.—The Summoner and His Concubine,	118
SCHOENBAUM, SAMUEL.—Chaucer's Black Knight,	121
PERSON, H. A.—Sewetours Call Them Brustyle,	122
WATSON, M. R.—Wyatt, Chaucer, and 'Terza Rima,'	124

REVIEWS:—

KARL JOST, <i>Wulfstanstudien</i> . [Dorothy Bethurum.]	125
JEAN JACQUOT, George Chapman (1559-1634). [Phyllis Bartlett.]	129
T. F. MUSTANOJA (ed.), <i>The Good Wife</i> . [D. C. Fowler.]	131
RENÉ JASINSKI, <i>Molière et le Misanthrope</i> . [H. C. Lancaster.]	133
U. T. HOLMES, JR., <i>Daily Living in the Twelfth Century</i> . [Grace Frank.]	135
F. L. GWYNN, <i>Sturge Moore and the Life of Art</i> . [J. H. Buckley.]	136
HORACE WYNDHAM, <i>Speranza: a Biography of Lady Wilde</i> . [J. H. Buckley.]	138
HORST FRENZ (ed.), <i>Whitman and Rolleston, A Correspondence</i> ,	139
DAVID DAICHES, Robert Burns. [F. B. Snyder.]	140
SISTER ROSE BERNARD DONNA, <i>Despair and Hope. A Study in Langland and Augustine</i> . [E. T. Donaldson.]	141
ARCHER TAYLOR and F. J. MOSHER, <i>The Bibliographical History of Anonyma and Pseudonyma</i> . [H. C. Lancaster.]	142

BRIEF MENTION: SAMUEL MOORE, <i>Historical Outlines of English Sounds and Inflections</i> , revised by A. H. MARCKWARDT; WALTER STAAKS, <i>The Theater of Louis-Benoît Picard</i> ; ALLARDYCE NICOLL (ed.), <i>Shakespeare Survey 4</i> ,	143
---	-----

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A Monthly Publication with intermission from July to October (inclusive)

Edited by H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

WILLIAM KURRELMeyer
KEMP MALONE
ARNO SCHIROKAUER

DON CAMERON ALLEN
CHARLES R. ANDERSON
EARL R. WASSERMAN

Advisory Editors

E. Feise, Grace Frank, J. C. French, R. D. Havens, E. Malakis,
L. Spitzer

The Subscription Price of the Current annual volume is \$6.00
for the United States and Mexico and \$6.50 for other countries
included in the Postal Union. Single issues, price one dollar.

Contributors and Publishers should send manuscripts and books for review to the Editors of Modern Language Notes, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore 18, Md., indicating on the envelope whether the contribution concerns English, German, or Romance. Every manuscript should be accompanied by a stamped and addressed return envelope. In accepting articles for publication, the editors will give preference to those submitted by subscribers to the journal. Foot-notes should be numbered continuously throughout each article; titles of books and journals should be italicized; titles of articles enclosed in quotation marks. Quotation marks are not used in verse quotations that form a paragraph. Write II, 3, not vol. II, p. 3. The following abbreviations are approved: *DNB.*, *JEGP.*, *MLN.*, *MLR.*, *MP.*, *NED.*, *PMLA.*, *PQ.*, *RR.*, *SP.*, *RES.*, *TLS.* Proof and MS. should be returned to the editors with an indication of the total number of reprints desired. Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore 18, Maryland.

CHAPTERS on CHAUCER

by KEMP MALONE

HERE is the perfect book to accompany the study of Chaucer, written by a foremost scholar of mediaeval literature. After an introductory chapter which places Geoffrey Chaucer and the fourteenth century into the proper literary and historical setting, Dr. Malone focuses his attention on the poems themselves, ex-

ploring the poet's methods, analyzing his technique, interpreting his stories in the light of the period in which he lived. The greater part of this work is devoted to a study of *Troilus and Criseyde* and to *The Canterbury Tales*, although the shorter poems come in for their share of critical attention. \$3.50

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS BALTIMORE 18, MARYLAND

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland. Postoffice
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103
Act of Congress of July 16, 1894.

2

litors
n the
script
ticles
o the
es of
Quo-
not
MP.,
litors
iness

Modern Language Notes

Volume LXVIII

FEBRUARY, 1953

Number 2

NEWMAN ON THE IMAGINATION

As many critics of John Henry Cardinal Newman have pointed out, his essay, "Poetry with Reference to Aristotle's *Poetics*" (1829), is proof that he entertained a high opinion of the creative imagination as it was defined and illustrated by some of the leading writers of his own generation. He writes in the poetry essay that the poet, with the aid of his imagination, "bounds and finishes off the confused luxuriance of real nature, . . . brings into sight the connexion of cause and effect, [and] completes the dependence of the parts one on another."¹ Understandably, flourishes such as this in the poetry essay have invited comparison to the theories of Coleridge² and Shelley³ on the imagination. The aim of this paper is to show, however, that when Newman turns from poetry to consider moral and religious questions, he tends to accept the Neo-classical definition of the imagination as a passive faculty subordinate to reason. This is not to say that the Neo-classical conception of the imagination is Newman's only source; his whole psychology of knowledge and faith doubtless owes much to a number of theologians, both Anglican and Catholic. Yet the similarity between Newman's theory of the imagination and that of Addison and Johnson is too close to be accidental. Nor should we be surprised to find a relationship, for throughout his works—whether in

¹ Albert S. Cook, ed., *Newman's Essay on Aristotle's Poetics* (Boston, 1891), p. 10.

² See W. R. Castle, Jr., "Newman and Coleridge," *Sewanee Review*, xvii (1909), 149.

³ See Alvan S. Ryan, "Newman's Conception of Literature," *Critical Studies in Arnold, Emerson, and Newman*, ed. J. E. Baker, University of Iowa Humanistic Studies, vi (1942), 133, 142.

a literary or a moral context—Newman expresses admiration for the great essayist as well as the wise author of *Rasselas*. Like them, he tends to consider the imagination a secondary faculty. It is still important, to be sure, for it functions as a stimulus to action while intensifying the joys of religious experience. But standing in the front of the chariot, holding the reins of decision, is the calm and dependable faculty of reason.⁴

1

In the *Idea of a University* Newman, at one point, suddenly becomes rather personal and tells of his early literary interests. "For myself when I was fourteen or fifteen, I imitated Addison; when I was seventeen, I wrote in the style of Johnson."⁵ A letter written in 1856 reveals that, in his maturity, he placed Addison and Johnson among the four classics of all English literature (Shakespeare and Pope being the other two). In this letter, written at the Birmingham Oratory on 24 December 1856, Newman advises Thomas Arnold, whom he had invited to become professor of English literature at the new Catholic university in Dublin, on the syllabus for a proposed course in English literature. It is significant that Newman singles out Addison first:

Periodical literature, and conversational essays are one great portion of English literature down to this day—and [Addison] is its patriarch in England. He has founded a *school*, as much as any English author, but Pope.⁶

Continuing in a laudatory vein—the letter is almost half taken up with the praises of Addison—Newman recalls that the great essayist was "an author, on whom I doted at 15." As to the

⁴ Newman thinks of reason as the only faculty which has the ability to draw inferences or to trace out the implications of a combination of facts; words he uses almost synonymously are "reasoning," "judgment," and "intellect." For typical usages see "Religious Faith Rational," *Parochial and Plain Sermons* (London, 1894), I, 192; *Apologia pro vita sua* (London, 1934), p. 7; and *An Essay in Aid of a Grammar of Assent* (London, 1888), p. 89.

⁵ *Idea of a University* (London, 1901), p. 322.

⁶ Quoted from J. Connop Thirlwall, "Cardinal Newman's Literary Preferences," *Modern Language Notes*, XLVIII (1933), 24. The other quotations are from pages 24 and 25.

syllabus Thomas Arnold was preparing, Newman gives this advice:

Must not you confine the two years to three to six chief classics? If so, they must be Shakespeare, (Milton?) [,] Pope, Clarendon (?) [,] Addison, Johnson. Or who?—Then for the next two years you might take Spenser—Bacon—Milton—the Novelists.

Or who indeed? Newman is unable to think of anyone more important than Shakespeare, Pope, Addison, and Johnson. Milton and Clarendon are question marks; Spenser is definitely a lesser light. At the close of the letter Newman repeats this same arrangement, only this time without the question marks:

I don't think you need chronology in your course. . . . It would be respectable to be acquainted with Shakespeare, Pope, Addison, and Johnson, and to *know about* (i. e. by means of professorial lectures) Spenser, Bacon[,] Dryden, Milton, Fielding. . . .

Newman's reference in this letter to Addison's *Vision of Mirza* indicates that he had read at least one of the *Spectator* essays (No. 159). And if he "doted on" Addison the essayist at fifteen, he may have read the *Spectator*, Nos. 411-421, on "The Pleasures of the Imagination." At any rate, Newman's references to the imagination show agreement with Addison on several important points. For both, the imagination is a faculty of the mind that, like a reservoir, stores up sense impressions; very closely allied with memory, it is a passive agent, acted upon rather than acting.⁷ Newman agrees with Addison that the imagination consists of images collected in the mind through the agency of sight:

We colour our ocular vision with the hues of the imagination: as reason is said to deceive our eyes in the phenomenon of the horizontal moon, so memory is a gloss upon them here. Our friend has grown fat, or his temples are higher, or his face is broader, or lines have come to view along his cheek, or across his forehead, and yet in certain cases we shall be heard to say, that such a one has not altered at all since the day we first knew him. To us his youth is stamped upon his maturity, and he lives in our

⁷ Addison says in the *Spectator*, No. 411: "The Pleasures of the Imagination have this Advantage, above those of the Understanding, that they are more obvious, and more easie to be acquired. It is but opening the Eye, and the Scene enters. The Colours paint themselves on the Fancy, with very little Attention of Thought or Application of Mind in the Beholder. We are struck, we know not how, with the Symmetry of any thing we see and immediately assent to the Beauty of an Object, without enquiring into the particular Causes and Occasions of it."

eye, as well as in our mind, as when we first gave him our affection. We are surprised on going into the world to hear him called a middle-aged man.⁹

Thus the imagination, through an association of images from the past, superimposes these images upon present events. We do not see our middle-aged friend as fat and bald; we see him as he used to look in the days of our youth. Such a vision of the past is a reproduction of our friend as he actually appeared to us then. Newman does not suggest that the imagination, of its own accord, creates something new in the process.

Addison's view that the imagination sets the "Animal Spirits in pleasing and agreeable Motions," thereby exerting a "kindly Influence on the Body, as well as the Mind,"⁹ is quite similar to an idea Newman advances in his early sermon, "The Religious Use of Excited Feelings," in which he maintains that the imagination, while not an active agent in religious belief, nevertheless "makes us love" the religious life in spite of its difficulties. With reason we see our duty, but the imagination and feelings affect us physically and mentally in such a way that we are able to enjoy the persistence in that duty. The imagination and feelings enable us "to take away from the *beginnings* of obedience its *grievousness*, to give us an impulse which may carry us over the first obstacles, and send us on our way rejoicing."¹⁰ This statement has the personal touch of the sermon, but it nevertheless represents Newman's considered view of the function of the imagination. In *Grammar of Assent*, while contrasting notional and real assents, he points out that

[real assent] is in itself an intellectual act, of which the object is presented to it by the imagination; and though the pure intellect does not lead to action, nor the imagination either, yet the imagination has the means, which pure intellect has not, of stimulating those powers of the mind from which action proceeds.¹¹

Thus the function of the imagination is to stimulate, to heighten the assent which is essentially an intellectual act. The idea is repeated in the section entitled "Real Assent," where Newman is

⁹ *Essays Critical and Historical* (London, 1890), II, 252.

⁹ *Spectator*, No. 411.

¹⁰ *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, I, 115.

¹¹ *Grammar of Assent*, p. 89.

speaking "of the normal constitution of our minds, and of the natural and rightful effect of acts of the imagination upon us, and this is, not to create assent, but to intensify it."¹²

Like Addison, then—and unlike Coleridge—Newman sees the imagination as a collection of images or pictures in the mind which may function as a stimulus. But where Addison tends to look upon the imagination only as a source of pleasure, Newman perceives also the torments and conflicts that can result from its over-stimulation. In the *Spectator*, No. 412, Addison writes boldly and rhapsodically:

Our Imagination loves to be filled with an Object, or to grasp at any thing that is too big for its Capacity. We are flung into a pleasing Astonishment at such unbounded Views, and feel a delightful Stilness and Amazement in the Soul at the Apprehension of them.¹³

But while Newman grants the salutary effects of the imagination properly used, he repeatedly emphasizes its great dangers. His temperament, somewhat more conservative than Addison's on this point, requires that he have the imagination completely under control.

The first inklings of Newman's perception of the dangers of the imagination appear in the early letters. As he writes to his sister Harriett in December, 1832, from Gibraltar, he seems to be shrinking distrustfully from the "sights" of the Mediterranean:

I no longer wonder at younger persons being carried away with travelling and corrupted; for certainly the illusions of the world's magic can hardly be fancied while one remains at home. I never felt any pleasure or danger from the common routine of pleasures, which most persons desire and suffer from—balls, or pleasure parties, or sights—but I think it does require strength of mind to keep the thoughts where they should be while the variety of strange sights—political, moral and physical—are passed before the eyes, as in a tour like this.¹⁴

What concerns him most is the seductive power of the imagination when it is filled to overflowing with the pleasurable sensations of the outside world. He writes to J. F. Christie from Rome in March, 1833:

¹² Page 82. See also page 63.

¹³ See also No. 411, where Addison maintains that a man imprisoned in a dungeon may use his imagination to entertain himself "with Scenes and Landships."

¹⁴ Anne Mozley, ed., *Letters and Correspondence of John Henry Newman During His Life in the English Church* (London, 1891), I, 297.

Now I am in for it the chance is I shall stop as long as I can, and see all that can be grasped in the time, for I sincerely hope never to go abroad again. I never loved home so well as now I am away from it—and the exquisite sights which foreign countries supply both to the imagination and the moral taste are most pleasurable in *memory*, but scarcely satisfactory as a present enjoyment. There is far too much tumult in seeing the places one has read so much about all one's life, to make it desirable for it to continue.¹⁵

From Catania, a few days later, he sends to Harriett a note that includes the following remark: "I was setting out on an expedition which would be pleasant in memory rather than in performance."¹⁶

2

In his emphasis on the dangers of the imagination Newman is closer to Johnson than he is to Addison. W. B. C. Watkins' analysis of the "perilous balance" between reason and imagination in Johnson may be applied, no less dramatically, to Newman.¹⁷ This proximity to Johnson in his attitude toward the imagination places Newman at the opposite pole, in some respects, to the critical theory of the Romantic generation. Newman does not share Coleridge's dejection over his loss of the "shaping spirit of Imagination." Instead, he rejoices as its influence becomes less strong, giving undisputed supremacy to reason.

While Johnson's distrust of the imagination is best illustrated in *Prayers and Meditations*, it appears also in *Rasselas*, the work of Johnson's that impressed Newman most. In Chapter 32 Imlac, the all-wise poet through whom Johnson speaks a bit too obviously, stands before a pyramid. After commenting that he thinks the pyramid was built at too great cost and labor, Imlac surmises that the structure "seems to have been erected only in compliance with that hunger of imagination which preys incessantly upon life, and must be always appeased by some employment."¹⁸ Then in Chapter 44, the title of which is "The Dangerous Prevalence of Imagination," Imlac affirms that "all power of fancy over reason is a degree of insanity" and vigorously warns against sending the

¹⁵ I, 366.

¹⁶ I, 396.

¹⁷ W. B. C. Watkins, *Perilous Balance* (Princeton, 1939), pp. 71-99.

¹⁸ *Rasselas* in *Eighteenth Century Prose*, ed. Lous I. Bredvold et al. (New York, 1932), p. 534 b.

"imagination out upon the wing." When the imagination is indulged,

all other intellectual gratifications are rejected; the mind, in weariness or leisure, recurs constantly to the favourite conception, and feasts on the luscious falsehood, whenever she is offended with the bitterness of truth. By degrees the reign of fancy is confirmed; she grows first imperious, and in time despotic. Then fictions begin to operate as realities, false opinions fasten upon the mind, and life passes in dreams of rapture or of anguish.¹⁹

Newman expresses the same attitude when he lays open the Arian heresy and sees why its attractive falsehood captivates the imagination:

Did you live in that day, my brethren, you could, perhaps, be looking with admiration at these Arians, as now you look at the Greeks;—not from love of their heresy, but, your imagination being affected by their number, power, and nobleness, you would try to make out that they really did hold the orthodox faith, or at least that it was not at all certain that they did not.²⁰

Unimportant details that reason casts aside may have profound effects upon the imagination, because the imagination has no power to discern the relative importance or significance of things. As Newman points out in the *Idea of a University*, if the reason has difficulty trying to make distinctions in a complex situation, the imagination, if not properly governed, may be the cause of a hasty and foolish action:

While, then, Reason and Revelation are consistent in fact, they often are inconsistent in appearance; and this seeming discordance acts most keenly and alarmingly on the Imagination, and may suddenly expose a man to the temptation, and even hurry him on to the commission, of definite acts of unbelief in which reason itself really does not come into exercise at all.²¹

The only remedy is to be on guard at all times against subtle effects upon the imagination.

3

Richard Kroner, in *The Religious Function of Imagination*, complains that although "Newman sees and acknowledges the

¹⁹ Page 548 a and b.

²⁰ *Lectures on Certain Difficulties Felt by Anglicans* (London, 1894), I, 4-5.

²¹ *Idea*, p. 401.

imaginative character of the content of religious belief, . . . in spite of this insight he emphasizes the intellectual act of the assent to a proposition."²² Mr. Kroner adds that since Newman

substitutes thought for imagination, [he] overrates the elements of intellectual assent, and underrates the other essential sides of religious life, namely the elements of imagination and emotion.

Newman himself would have agreed with this analysis—after taking exception to the word "underrates." He would have pointed out that he does not underrate the imagination at all, but merely slides it into its proper place, which is one notch below reason.

In the poetry essay, of course, the emphasis is quite different. One should remember, however, that Newman's view of poetry as lyrical expression leaves reason out of the picture altogether. For he thinks of poetry, by definition, as an exercise of the imagination: "Poetry may be considered to be the gift of moving the affections through the imagination, and its object to be the beautiful."²³ When he considers poetry in isolation, he almost automatically commends the imagination. But theological and philosophical discourse—which, if one may judge by its bulk alone, is infinitely more important to Newman than poetry—demands something of all the faculties while relying mostly on reason.

MERRITT E. LAWLIS

Indiana University

MODES OF ETHICAL SENSIBILITY IN HAWTHORNE

The Scarlet Letter represents symbolically and dramatically various phases or postures of man's ethical sensibility. The symbolic representation is accomplished through utilization of various symbolic possibilities¹ of the environment. The Puritan Village, with its jail, its cemetery, its scaffold—and its secluded gardens wherein

²² Richard Kroner, *The Religious Function of Imagination* (New Haven, 1941), p. 24.

²³ Cook, *Newman's Essay on Aristotle's Poetics*, p. 29.

¹ For explication which explores some central symbols of the book see H. H. Waggoner, "Nathaniel Hawthorne: The Cemetery, the Prison, and the Rose," *Univ. of Kansas City Rev.*, xiv (Spring, 1948), 175-190.

exotic fruits and flowers and weeds were growing—expresses traits of the Calvinist temper and way of life. All around the village was “that wild, heathen Nature of the forest, never subjugated by human law, nor illumined by higher truth,” full of wild beasts, wild men, and wild flowers—with vague, perhaps illusive, apparitions haunting its dark vistas. And arching over all was “the muffled sky”—obscured by clouds, or bright with sun, or shrouded in midnight blackness sometimes rent by the “strange and solemn splendor” of meteors, like “so many revelations from a supernatural source.”²

The dramatic representation of modes of ethical sensibility in *The Scarlet Letter* is, of course, accomplished through the actions and speeches of characters. Like all great literature, *The Scarlet Letter* considers the central problem of humanity: the plight of the willing, desiring, aspiring, endeavoring person in a world obedient to other behests than those he would enjoin. He must subdue the world to himself, or himself to the world as he apprehends it, if his life is not to be a continual thwarting.

The mode of accommodation which man seeks with the world must depend upon how he apprehends the world—more especially, upon the nature of the external constraints and restraints, imposed upon him by the external world, of which his characteristic activities and preoccupations have made him most aware.

1. The *pietist*³ sees a world controlled by moral law. His solution to the problem of the individual versus the world is to subdue self to the divine decrees manifest in the operation of things. Just as essential as self-discipline (man's suppression of a perverse egoism) is love (his expression of affection toward something superior to himself). The pietist's self-restraint is thus a self-liberation, “losing himself, he finds himself”; he is free of the frustration of being driven along impossible ways by selfish and alienating tendencies, free to find fulfilment within a system of moral reality opened to him by his recognition of a moral world. The moral law which the sinner thinks he can set aside is, to the

² The quotations in this paragraph are all from *The Scarlet Letter*.

³ I have arbitrarily appropriated terms to distinguish ethical characters to be defined in this paper; I hope to prevent objection to my appropriation of these terms by discriminating clearly the meanings I intend them to convey.

pietist, as absolute and inviolable as is physical law to the naturalist. Thus, the adulterers in *The Scarlet Letter* do not "break" the moral law except in the sense that a high jumper breaks the law of gravity: in either case, the law is absolute, unremitting in its effective operation, and orders all things ultimately in their due relations despite the aberrant impulses of creatures under its control.

In *The Scarlet Letter* the pietist position is represented by the minister, Arthur Dimmesdale. Although he has sinned in yielding to a selfish carnal impulse, he abhors his sin; he loves the moral reality which he lacks strength to affirm. It is his misfortune to be a man of a passive disposition; after his sin, he is not evilly disposed, but rather is morally supine and desperate.

2. Essentially like the pietist's vision of the world is that of the *theocrat*. He too sees a world governed by moral law, but believes it expedient to translate divine law into a scheme of human codes and institutions. Whereas the pietist requires that man directly accept and lovingly choose moral life, the theocrat envisages man's recalcitrance, and attempts by means of inquisitions and punishments to compel moral behavior.

In *The Scarlet Letter* the theocratic point of view is represented by the Puritan community generally, and by the characters of the ruling ministers especially. They require the stubborn sinners whom they detect to submit themselves for correction, not to the government of God directly, but to a government of men which professes to derive its sanction from divine edicts.

3. The *scientist* sees the world as being primarily an operation of physical law. Acknowledging the impossibility of imposing his private will upon external things, he bows before physical necessity, but like the pietist achieves a kind of freedom by understanding and willing conformity. Just as the pietist is in a sense liberated by invigorating the moral forces within him and thus vitalizing his role in a moral universe, so does the scientist achieve a kind of control over life beyond himself by understanding the physical laws operating in himself and in external things and by enduing his efforts with their strength. The scientist is liable to *hubris* because he can hardly avoid regarding himself as the most knowing and self-conscious, and therefore the most nearly independent, phenomenon in his world; he discerns nothing in his physical world more intelligent or noble or free or deserving than himself.

In *The Scarlet Letter* the scientist's point of view is represented by Roger Chillingworth, whose meddling intellect furnishes the means and prompts the presumptuousness necessary to attempt what his injured self-love demands—vengeance upon the guilty pair on whom nature had thrust unasked the gift of physical passion which Chillingworth sought in vain. From the pietist's point of view, Chillingworth's implacability was usurpation of the office of vengeance which the Lord has reserved to himself.

4. The *utilitarian* translates the scientist's view into a scheme of codes and institutions, just as the moralist translates piety into a mundane system. Whereas the theocrat derives social principles from a supposed reality higher than man (a world of spiritual absolutes), the utilitarian derives them from a reality lower than man (a world of physical necessities).

Although to some degree a utilitarian calculus is necessarily present in all societies, since any social system must somehow express and regulate man's physical necessities, it is not represented by an individual exponent in *The Scarlet Letter*. Hawthorne turned almost immediately thereafter to a consideration of the utilitarian concerns of society in *The Blithedale Romance*, but it would have been anachronistic for anyone to advocate explicitly in the mid-17th century Boston of *The Scarlet Letter* social theories largely articulated by John Locke.

5. The *romantic individualist* attempts a more imperious solution to the conflict between the world and the individual than any so far noticed in this paper. Adopting the pose of Blake's Pebble, he tries to "build a Heaven in Hell's despite." He tries to subdue the world instead of subduing himself.

In *The Scarlet Letter* Hester represents this attitude,⁴ by trying to erect her own desires into the effective principles of her world. "The world's law was no law for her mind." As she desperately insists to Dimmesdale: "What we did had a consecration of its own. We felt it so!" Even in the climactic scene of her paramour's death she frantically queries: "Shall we not spend our immortal life together?"

6. The *amoralist* has still another mode of apprehending the

⁴ See my article "Hawthorne's Hester," *College English*, XIII (March, 1952), 303-309.

world and of finding a practicable mode of existence in it. He lives by instinct, a morally unconscious participant in the natural processes of the world.⁵

In *The Scarlet Letter* Pearl represents this phase of human development.⁶ The "wild, heathen Nature of the forest," on whose verge she lives with her mother in a cottage abandoned by its builder because the soil thereabouts would not repay cultivation, is used symbolically to re-enforce this concept. Pearl's affinities with Nature constitute her only real existence until the crucial scene wherein her father resumes his moral life and thereby quickens the moral life in Pearl. Pearl, however, is not merely a Nature Girl pending this climax; she lives near the Village though temporarily outcast, and is incipiently human and capable of moral life. She represents in the romance the way in which moral development of children may be contingent upon moral truth and responsibility in their parents.

7. The *illusionist* practices another technique of manipulating inner or outer reality in order to contrive a tolerable adjustment between the world and the individual. The illusionist may take refuge in fantasy—the expedient of weak and passive characters who despair of controlling reality. The possibility of refuge from a too-exigent reality in the Hall of Fantasy appealed powerfully to the detached, passive, speculative mind of Hawthorne, and he handled the possibility in numerous early tales, notably "P.'s Correspondence," "The Journal of a Solitary Man," and "The Village Uncle."⁷

A superior—because more stable, visible, and relevant—illusion is that constructed by Art, which from a world of imperfect and perishing things reconstitutes a world of more nearly perfect and enduring forms. Hawthorne was eventually to consider at length, and reject as impracticable, this esthetic control of life, in *The Marble Faun*: the ruinous art and architecture of Rome show that the world of Art perishes too, and in its decay is more oppressive,

⁵ In *The Marble Faun* the role of Donatello illustrates the impossibility and undesirability of man's laying down the burden of moral consciousness once he has assumed it: there can be no return to innocence.

⁶ See my article "Hawthorne's Pearl: Symbol and Character," *ELH*, xviii (March, 1951), 50-66.

⁷ See my article "The Theme of Isolation in Hawthorne," *Personalist*, xxxii (Winter, 1951; Spring, 1951), 42-59, 182-190.

because of the vast enduringness of its ruins, than is a world of reality in which the forms of Nature expire rapidly but constantly reproduce themselves in their pristine albeit flawed excellence. This is a less favorable view of the effectuality of Art in stabilizing and perfecting life than Hawthorne had reached in his earlier consideration of the subject. In "The Artist of the Beautiful" the destruction of his most consummate creation by an uncomprehending and brutal infant is viewed with complacency by the Artist, because "When the Artist rose high enough to achieve the beautiful, the symbol by which he made it perceptible to mortal senses became of little value in his eyes while his spirit possessed itself in enjoyment of the reality."⁸ That the esthetic control of life, the artist's mode of accommodating the world to the individual, is not represented explicitly in *The Scarlet Letter* may of course be accounted for by the fact that it too would have been an anachronistic point of view in this historic setting.

* * * * *

Hawthorne represented in *The Scarlet Letter* as many of these modes and phases of apprehending the world as were appropriate to the time and place of his narrative. The persons embodying these different attitudes test their truth and utility in an actual moral situation in which all the characters are intimately involved, and which each seeks to control according to the imperatives laid upon him by his vision of the world. From this contention of values emerges a demonstration that the world is governed by a moral providence. The presumptuous scientist Chillingworth, who seeks to exploit by physical means a spiritual province, is balked, and shrivels into moral non-existence through the atrophy of his spiritual faculties. The sinful but chastened pietist Dimmesdale is granted the grace of a dramatic salvation, not through his desert, but through the loving-kindness of God. The "wild infant" Pearl is elevated to moral life by her parent's tardy return to piety. The errant passions of the romantic individualist Hester do not yield to a better mood (although the "Conclusion" intimates that this came eventually), but she is prevented by her paramour's confession

⁸ See R. H. Fogle, "The Artist of the Beautiful," *Tulane Studies in English*, 1 (1949), 31-52.

and her child's love from lapsing into mere naturalism. What has been hidden, is made known: moral law prevails, and under it all lower laws and values are assigned their subordinate places: and by this Remarkable Providence, only dimly comprehended, the whole community of sinful, groping humankind is edified.

DARREL ABEL

Purdue University

THE RELATIONSHIP OF LANCELOT AND GUENEVERE IN MALORY'S "TALE OF LANCELOT"

Students of the sources¹ for the *Morte D'Arthur*² seem not to have stressed sufficiently what appears to be Malory's intentional originality in his handling of the Lancelot-Guenevere relationship in the "Tale of Lancelot," the third main division of the *Morte D'Arthur* (I, 248-287). Through comparison of this tale with its chief source, the Agravain section of the Old French Prose *Lancelot*,³ I shall show (1) that four of the five references in the tale to the Lancelot-Guenevere relationship are Malory's original additions, and (2) that these references, taken together, serve to unify the tale, and almost certainly represent Malory's effort to fit the "Tale of Lancelot" into a progressive development of the Lancelot-Guenevere relationship which runs through the *Morte D'Arthur*.

¹ Eugene Vinaver (ed.), *The Works of Sir Thomas Malory*, 3 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1947), pp. 1398-1416. See especially R. H. Wilson, "Malory and the Perlesvaus," *MP*, xxx (1932), 13-22; "Malory's Early Knowledge of Arthurian Romance," *University of Texas Studies in English*, xxix (1950), 33-50; and "Notes on Malory's Sources," *MLN*, lxvi (1951), 22-26. Wilson has called attention to many of the passages I use in this paper, but he employed them, along with numerous others, to establish somewhat more general conclusions, which I find thoroughly convincing.

² In this paper the references to Malory's text are by volume, page, and line number in the edition cited in footnote one.

³ H. Oskar Sommer (ed.), *The Vulgate Version of the Arthurian Romances* (Washington: The Carnegie Institution, 1912), vol. v ("Le Livre de Launcelot del Lac"). The references in this paper to the Old French texts are by volume, page, and line number in this edition.

But, first, let us see briefly how the "Tale of Lancelot" matches its sources.

In the tale Lancelot sets out with Lionel in search of adventures. While Lancelot is asleep Tarquyn captures and imprisons Lionel and Ector de Mares. Meanwhile, four queens capture Lancelot and he must choose one as his paramour, or die. With the help of King Bagdemagus' daughter, Lancelot escapes. Soon he experiences the adventure with Belleus, whom he conquers. Then he wins victory in the tournament for King Bagdemagus. Next, Lancelot sees and kills Tarquyn, thus freeing Lionel and the other prisoners. Then follows his conquest of Perys de Foreste Savage. Three days later he kills the two giants who hold the castle of Tintagel. Now comes a series of brief adventures: Lancelot rescues Kay from three knights; he overcomes Gawtere, Gylmere, and Raynolde; he defeats four knights of the Round Table. Next, he saves the life of Melyot de Logrys, after which he escapes an attempt on his own life by Phelot. Finally, he overcomes Sir Pedyvere and returns to Arthur's court, where those whom he has conquered have assembled to attest Lancelot's outstanding deeds.

For these numerous episodes, Malory is indebted mainly to several widely separated sections of the Prose *Lancelot*.⁴ The material up to the point at which Lancelot leaves King Bagdemagus is based upon successive episodes in the source; the narrative from that point through the liberation of Tintagel comes from a much later section of the Prose *Lancelot*; and, as Miss Weston and more recently R. H. Wilson have shown, the remaining materials, except for two episodes, are derived from two other sections of the Prose *Lancelot*. Of the two additional episodes, the Phelot adventure has no known source, and the Melyot adventure parallels a section of the *Perlesvaus*.

This brief summary of Malory's third tale and its sources will suggest the well known fact that he greatly reduced the bulk of his source material, and also that he wove the incidents selected into a tightly unified short narrative. We shall now see that one important device he used to unify the various events within the tale is represented by two of his five references to the Lancelot-Guenevere relationship.

At the beginning of the tale Malory states that after their return from Rome Arthur and his knights held many "joustys and turnementes," in which various knights won honor; then he continues:

⁴ See Sommer, v, 87-102, 204-214, 160-162, 167-168, 306-318.

But in especial hit was prevyd on sir Launcelot de Lake, for in all turnementes, justys, and deys of armys, both for lyff and deth, he passed all other knyghtes, and at no tyme was he ovirecom but yf hit were by treson other inchauntement. So this sir Launcelot eneresed so mervaylously in worship and honoure; therefore he is the fyrste knyght that the Freynsh booke makyth mencion of aftir kynge Arthure com frome Rome. Wherefore quene Gwenyvere had hym in grete favoure aboven all other knyghtis, and so he loved the quene agayne aboven all other ladyes dayes of his lyff, and for hir he dud many dedys of armys and saved her from the fyre thorow his noble chevalry. (I, 248, 8-19)

This introductory passage of nineteen lines does not match any section of Malory's source. It is obviously his device for connecting the "Tale of Lancelot" with the immediately preceding second section of the *Morte D'Arthur*, the "Tale of Arthur and Lucius." In that tale, one of Malory's chief alterations of his source, the Middle English alliterative *Morte Arthure*, was to raise Lancelot from a knight who is mentioned but six times casually to the chief position among the knights of the Round Table.⁵ It is therefore readily understandable, after Lancelot's outstanding achievements in the second tale, for Malory, in the introductory passage for the third tale, to call Lancelot "the fyrste knyght." Professor Vinaver strangely interprets this comment to mean that Lancelot was first in chronological mention;⁶ the context seems to me to make clear that Malory here means to point to Lancelot's having attained the first or preeminent place among Arthur's knights. This reading is made certain by Malory's next sentence: "Wherefore quene Gwenyvere had hym in grete favour aboven all other knyghtis. . . ." Guenevere has this regard for Lancelot because he is Arthur's outstanding knight, not because he is chronologically first to be mentioned.

Further, the implication is that Lancelot set out to prove himself in the "straunge adventures" which make up the third tale in order to win the approval of Guenevere, whom he already loves. Certainly, this desire for the Queen's approval seems present when, in the course of his various adventures, he tells a number of his conquered opponents to go to the court and "yelde you unto quene Gwenyvere." Malory found in the Prose *Lancelot* the idea for this

⁵ Mary E. Dichmann, "Characterization in Malory's *Tale of Arthur and Lucius*," *PMLA*, LXV (1950), 877-895.

⁶ See Vinaver, III, 1398.

second use in the tale of the Lancelot-Guenevere relationship. In the French text Lancelot, after rescuing Kay, overcomes four knights at the bridge—the incident from which Malory develops Lancelot's fight with Gawtere, Gylmere, and Raynolde (I, 275, 7-277, 3); in the Old French story, after conquering the fourth knight, Lancelot says:

Dont te commanch . . . que tu le iour de pentecoste soies a la cort monseignor le roy artu et illuec te rendras a madame la royne de par keu le senescal et conteras ceste auenture par deuant tous ceuls de laiens.

(v, 308, 40-42)

Malory has Lancelot apply this necessity of yielding to Guenevere not only to the knights conquered at the bridge but also to the three knights who attacked Kay (I, 274, 8). There is also in the Prose *Lancelot* the incident in which Lancelot forces the knight who cuts off the damsel's head to report to the Queen (v, 161-162, 167-168); from this incident, of course, Malory developed the Pedyvere episode (I, 284-286). It would seem, then, that Malory has used both the opening reference to the Lancelot-Guenevere relationship and Lancelot's ordering a number of the conquered knights to yield to the Queen at the concluding assembly as a chief unifying device for his "Tale of Lancelot."

There are also in the tale three specific conversations, original with Malory, in which various characters refer to Lancelot's and Guenevere's interest in each other (I, 257-258, 270-271, 281). The four queens inform Lancelot of their knowledge that he can love only Guenevere; he replies: "And as for my lady, dame Gwenyvere, were I at my lyberté as I was, I wolde prove hit on youres that she is the treweste lady unto hir lorde lyvyng." Later, the damsel who has led Lancelot to his successful adventures against Tarquyn and Perys tells Lancelot that she and many others regret the rumor that he loves Guenevere and can love no other lady; Lancelot puzzlingly replies that an adventurous knight such as he cannot be bothered with either a wife or paramours. Finally, in the Melyot episode, Hallewes the Sorceress tells Lancelot as he is leaving the Castel Perilous that she loves him, that she realizes no woman can have him alive except Guenevere, and that she (Hallewes) wished to have his "body dede . . . dyspyte of quene Gwenyvere." To this fearsome disclosure Lancelot simply replies: "Jesu preserve me frome youre subtile crauftys!"

The total effect of these five indications of a relationship between Lancelot and Guenevere is, I think, easily grasped: Lancelot loves the Queen, and he orders the individuals he conquers to report to her in order to show her that he performs such feats for her sake; she, because of his knightly eminence, holds him "in grete favoure aboven all other knyghtis," but she has as yet given him no indication that she will grant him her love; he therefore can maintain stoutly to the four queens that Guenevere is completely true to Arthur, he can feel justified in answering the damsel who led him to Tarquyn and Perys with the half-truth to the effect that he is more interested in adventures than in women, and he can refrain from meaningful comment about Guenevere to Hallewes.

Further, it is not particularly difficult to fit this total effect into Malory's handling of the Lancelot-Guenevere relationship throughout the *Morte D'Arthur*. I take it that an intentional general pattern of progressive development for this adulterous relationship runs through the book as a whole, and that this pattern should be regarded as a pivotal factor in the collapse of the Round Table.⁷ Before the "Tale of Lancelot," Arthur sees, loves, and decides to marry Guenevere; Merlin warns Arthur that Lancelot and Guenevere will love each other, but Arthur disregards this warning and weds her (I, 39, 97-98). Also before the third tale, we have had one slight indication of Lancelot's love for Guenevere: he is "passynge wrothe" because Tristram is allowed to join Iseult in Cornwall instead of going to fight the Romans, whereas Lancelot must leave Guenevere and go to the wars with Arthur (I, 195, 11-13). But, after the "Tale of Lancelot," we have the development of the adulterous relationship and its catastrophic effects upon the characters involved and upon the whole society of the Round Table. Thus, within this large pattern, the function of the references in the third tale to the Lancelot-Guenevere relationship is to show the two characters, in their own minds and in the minds of society at large, drawing more closely together in preparation for the adultery, which comes to be a matter of almost common knowledge by the time we reach the fifth tale, that of Tristram (I, 425, 430).

It is also noteworthy, I think, that in the "Tale of Lancelot"

⁷ Vinaver does not hold this view. He argues that Malory conceived of and produced his writings not as a unified work with a central theme but as eight separate romances. See *Works*, I, xxix-xxxv.

two of the five references to the Lancelot-Guenevere relationship are made by supernatural figures—Morgan le Fay and Hallewes—who thereby reinforce the effect of Merlin's earlier prophecy to Arthur. Further, Malory's careful attention to this problem is almost certainly to be observed in his alteration to Tintagel of the name for the castle held by the two giants whom Lancelot kills (I, 272, 27-30). This name and the mention of Ygraine and Uther carry the reader back to Arthur's being conceived before the marriage of his father and mother (I, 10, 26-27), a situation which in the book as a whole—like that between Arthur and his sister Morgawse, from which Mordred was born (I, 41, 22-25)—has immensely important thematic connections with the adulterous relationship of Lancelot and Guenevere.

We have seen, then, that of the five references in the "Tale of Lancelot" to the relationship between Lancelot and Guenevere, four are original with Malory. These references help to unify the tale, and it seems perfectly possible that they should be viewed as Malory's intentional effort to fit the "Tale of Lancelot" into the progressive development of the Lancelot-Guenevere relationship which runs through the *Morte D'Arthur*. Most important, perhaps, is the fact that Malory chose in the "Tale of Lancelot" to change the adultery between Lancelot and Guenevere, which he found clearly stated in the Old French Prose *Lancelot* (v, 177-195), to a platonic relationship.

R. M. LUMIANSKY

Tulane University

ON THE SEQUENCE OF BEOWULF'S *GEOGOÐ*

The career of an atheling is represented in the epic *Beowulf* as a continuum of time reaching between the poles of youth—"geogoð"—and age—"ylðo." To youth is given strength in battle, to age the wisdom that is founded on the memory of a long life. This wisdom is usually denied to youth, just as age customarily is deprived of the joys of strength. The athelings traversing the period of youth are designated individually by such terms as "magoðegn," "magorinc," or "hyse," collectively by the terms "magodriht"

and "geogoð."¹ The epithet most apposite to age is "frod." Between the poles of youth and age extends an intermediate period, the members of which are often designated collectively as "duguð." The members of this intermediate group approximate the virtues peculiar to either pole; thus the "duguð" retain some of the strength of youth and anticipate some of the wisdom of age.

With this intermediate period in the life of its hero, the epic *Beowulf* is hardly concerned. It is rather an epic of his youth and age. The two actions which it signalizes are polar both in time and value. One is thus, in a medieval sense, the narrative of a comic reversal, the other the narrative of a tragic catastrophe.² One represents the triumph of the "magoðegn," the other the fall of the "frod cyning." The intermediate period is omitted because it is not the significant period in *Beowulf's* life. Rather it is from the poles that his career derives its peculiar meaning—from the eld that was not only wise but strong and from the youth that was not only strong but wise.³

Beowulf is thus a singular man. Neither his strength nor his wisdom is a concomitant of time. His wisdom precedes memory; his strength survives his youth. However, it is not only of time that his strength and wisdom are thus more than usually independent. They are similarly independent of the strength and wisdom his fellow men. Hence it is incongruous either that his wisdom should go to school to the wisdom of others or that his strength should appeal to alien strength. If this singularity of *Beowulf* is firmly apprehended by the reader of the poem, he will then see unfolding in clearer sequence the otherwise problematic *geogoð* of *Beowulf*.

Rudimentary traces of this singularity may be discerned in the earliest feat assigned to *Beowulf*. This is the swimming match with Breca. Since it falls in that indeterminate period when

¹ Wealhtheow addresses *Beowulf* as "hyse" (v. 1217^a); *Beowulf* introduces himself to Hrothgar as "magoðegn" (v. 408^a). "Magodriht" varies "geogoð" (vv. 66 b-67^a). Citations from *Beowulf* are to the text ed. Fr. Klaeber, 3d ed. (New York, 1950).

² See my "*Beowulf* 3150," forthcoming in *MLN*.

³ The latter motif—the *juvenis senex* topos—is clearly associated with *Beowulf* by Hrothgar, vv. 1705 b-1706^a, 1842 b-1845^a. This topos is a variant of the *puer senex* topos; see E. R. Curtius, *Europäische Literatur und lateinisches Mittelalter* (Bern, 1948), pp. 106-109.

Beowulf is both boy and youth,⁴ it presents no more than an incipient manifestation of this singularity. It reveals the steadfast resolution,⁵ but not the wisdom that precludes foolhardiness, the preternatural strength, but not the force of mind—"higeprym"—that later would impel Beowulf always to the forefront of strife.⁶ Nor does the famous grip figure in this episode—the grip which was to objectify the singularity that no more needed weapons than it needed men. Yet even now it was Beowulf's lot, by the intervention of the storm, to conclude the feat alone.

It is this singularity, no longer incipient, but endowed with plenitude of power as if overnight by its own prodigious dynamism, that must explain the ensuing interval of Beowulf's *geogoð*. In the career of the normal atheling this period would have been probationary. He would submit his strong, young body to the wise discipline of his elders. He would serve not as a leader but as one of the led. In battle he would fight not before, but beside his lord. Not so the singular Beowulf. It would be incongruous to link so extraordinary a "*magoðegn*" to so ordinary a novice; it would infringe upon decorum to commit this *juvenis senex* to subordinate participation in a collective endeavor. Since the poet could not, without seeming incongruous, predicate such activity of Beowulf during this probationary period, he chose to predicate quiescence (vv. 2183^b-2188^a).⁷ Thus, for a long time Beowulf is dissociated from his fellow athelings. He withholds himself from the activities in which his contemporaries are engrossed, and so he is rejected by the Geats and their lord, who cannot but mistake this singular quiescence for sloth and spiritlessness.⁸ In this period of alienation,

⁴ Beowulf describes himself then as "*crihtwesende*" (v. 535^b) and "*on geogoðfeore*" (v. 537^a). The sons of Hrothgar are at this indeterminate age when Heorot is cleansed, for in the celebration that follows the vanquishing of Grendel, Wealhtheow refers to them both as "*geogoðe*" (v. 1181^b) and "*enyhtum*" (v. 1219^b).

⁵

ne leof ne lað,	Ne inc ænig mon,
sorhfullne sið,	belean mihte
	þa git on sund reon;
	(vv. 510 ^b -512 ^b)

⁶ "no ic fram him wolde" (v. 543^b).

⁷ This interpretation of Beowulf's quiescence does not necessarily exclude the quasi-religious motivation proposed by Kemp Malone, "Young Beowulf," *JEGP*, xxxvi (1937), 21-23.

⁸ It is to the period of Beowulf's quiescence, perhaps, that Haethcyn's

it may be presumed, even the luster of Beowulf's surpassing of Breca would tarnish; from the assertion that someone as slothful as Beowulf could not possibly have outdone Breca, people would pass to the categorical statement that Breca had outdone Beowulf. This would be the report that Unferth was to revive some years later when Beowulf came for the cleansing of Heorot.

In the cleansing of Heorot, the youth of Beowulf attains its culmination. The accomplishment of this feat represents the "edwenden,"⁹ the ultimate reversal and in a medieval sense the comic reversal, not only of Hrothgar's unhappiness, but of the humiliation that Beowulf long endured in his period of quiescence. This supreme reversal is preceded, however, by a series of minor reversals, in which the "magoðegn," emerging from the quiescence he has now outgrown, prefigures his supreme triumph (vv. 419-424^a).¹⁰ Thus, the Geats have looked on ("ofersawon") as he

fatal incursion against the Swedes and the vengeance subsequently inflicted upon Ongentheow by Eofor are to be assigned, since the poet nowhere explicitly links Beowulf to these activities. If it could be presumed further (1) that Beowulf's quiescence was confined to these activities and (2) that a link or bond existed between the Waegmundings—and therefore Beowulf—and the Swedes, it might seem plausible to impute Beowulf's quiescence to such a link as would inhibit a Waegmunding from engaging in hostile action against the Swedes. The postulation of such a link might serve to explain (1) why Ecgtheow sought refuge with Hrothgar, the brother-in-law of the Swedish Onela; (2) why Onela permitted Beowulf to rule the Geats after Onela had slain Heardred. However, if such a link existed, Beowulf must have felt it sufficiently abrogated by Onela's invasion of Geatland and his slaying of Heardred to permit Beowulf subsequently to avenge Heardred by abetting Eadgils in his struggle against Onela. The questions then arise (1) why Beowulf had not considered the link similarly broken when the Swedes earlier invaded the realm of the Geats and thus provoked the fatal incursion of Haethcyn and (2) why, if Beowulf did consider the link broken at that time, he refrained from action then against the Swedes.

This hypothesis, therefore, seems rather to obscure than to clarify the motivation of Beowulf's quiescence.

Edwenden cwom

tireadigum menn torna gehwylces. (vv. 2188 b-2189 b)

Cf. vv. 280^a and (tragic) 1774^b.

¹⁰ Kemp Malone, "Notes on *Beowulf*," *Anglia*, LXIX (1950), 295-300, definitely places these feats before the quiescence; Adrien Bonjour, *The Digressions in "Beowulf"* (Oxford, 1950), p. 27, n. 4, puts them after the quiescence.

destroyed giants and slew water-monsters¹¹ in the night; they have seen him come bloody from these battles, which he fought to avenge their affliction—but they have not participated. The singular hero has confirmed his manhood alone.

It is to these deeds with which he initiated the course of his comic reversal that Beowulf refers in his *gilpcwide* at Hrothgar's court. He refers to these deeds not with the preterite "genæs" or "geneðde" (vv. 2426^b, 2511^b), as he would many decades after, when, confronted with the tragedy of his eld, he would speak his last *gilpcwide*.¹² Rather he uses now the perfect tense:

Ic eom Higelaces
mæg ond magoðegn; hæbbe ic mærdða fela
ongunnen on geogoðe. (vv. 407^b-409^a)

Because these deeds have intervened between the period of quiescence and the hero's arrival at Hrothgar's court, Unferth is not prompted to disparage Beowulf with the charge of lethargy. Instead he is forced to revive an almost forgotten calumny.¹³

GEORGE J. ENGELHARDT

*Loyola University,
Chicago, Illinois.*

¹¹ The sea-monsters slain by Beowulf in his swimming match with Breca (vv. 555^b-569^a) are not to be identified with the water-monsters listed in the *gilpcwide* with which Beowulf introduces himself to Hrothgar (v. 422^a). The actions in which each set of monsters figures are quite distinct. After slaying the former monsters, Beowulf emerged alone on the shore of the Lapps. But Beowulf's own people were watching as he emerged from his contest with the latter monsters, whom he killed, not to protect himself in a profitless sport, but to avenge his people.

¹² Similarly, the old Hrothgar: "on geogoðe heold" (v. 466^a).

¹³ The charge of Unferth and answer of Beowulf serves a proleptic as well as an expository function. Beowulf's slaying the sea-monsters at night prefigures his nocturnal vanquishing of Grendel; Beowulf's prowess in the sea prefigures his attack upon Grendel's dam beneath the mere. Unferth's charge is definitively answered when his sword proves useless against Grendel's dam.

FÍGARO EN LISBOA, AN UNPUBLISHED ARTICLE BY
MARIANO JOSÉ DE LARRA

Among the papers and documents left by Larra, who died by his own hand in February, 1837, is the unpublished manuscript of an important article entitled *Fígaro en Lisboa — Adiós a la patria — Último artículo*. This had been overlooked by Carmen de Burgos when she prepared her well-known book on Larra.¹ It was discovered among the *papeles de Fígaro*² by the late F. Courtney Tarr, of Princeton University, who in turn, at his untimely death in 1939, bequeathed to me a photostat of a portion of the original and a manuscript copy of the remainder. It was to have formed part of Tarr's book to be called *Páginas desconocidas de Larra*.

Although it has been thought that the article was written in Paris in June of 1835,³ the title *Fígaro en Lisboa* suggests that it was begun, though certainly not finished, in Lisbon during Larra's brief stay there in April and May of that year. He crossed the boundary into Portugal on April 27, arrived in the capital the following day, and sailed for England on May 17.⁴ It is clear from the context that the work was finished after his arrival in Paris on June 6. The reference to the "público madrileño de Junio de 1835" in the first paragraph does not necessarily mean, however, that the article was begun as well as finished in Paris. It is possible that in using the word *junio*, Larra intended to complete his manuscript and send it to the *Revista Mensajero* in Madrid for publication at a date which would not be before June at the earliest. Sánchez Estevan has published a notice which appeared in this periodical on May 24, reading in part as follows:

Con fecha 16 nos escribe nuestro colaborador *Fígaro* desde Lisboa, y a la remisión de varios artículos, producto de su brillante pluma, reúne algunas noticias. . . .⁵

¹ Carmen de Burgos (Colombine), *Fígaro (Revelaciones, "Ella" descubierta, Epistolario inédito)*. Madrid, 1919.

² In the possession of Larra's grandson, Don Carlos de Larra.

³ See F. C. Tarr, "More Light on Larra," *Hispanic Review*, IV (1936), 89-110, n. 70.

⁴ Ismael Sánchez Estevan, *Mariano José de Larra (Fígaro)*, Madrid, 1934, p. 152.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 152.

One of the articles referred to in this item may have been—almost certainly was—*Impresiones de un viaje—Última ojeada sobre Extremadura—Despedida a la patria*, in which Larra tells of his crossing over into Portugal.⁶ The ending of this article and the beginning of *Fígaro en Lisboa*, together with its subtitles (*Adiós a la patria—Último artículo*), suggest that we have here a sequel, the last of Larra's works which grew out of his journey across Extremadura. The last words of *Impresiones de un viaje* are these:

Un minuto después la patria quedaba atrás, y arrebatado con la velocidad del viento, como si hubiera temido que un resto de antiguo afecto mal pagado le detuviera, o le hiciera vacilar en su determinación, expatriado corría los campos de Portugal. Entonces el escritor de costumbres no observaba: el hombre era solo el que sentía.

The introduction to *Fígaro en Lisboa* echoes these words in its rejection of *costumbres* as a theme (for this article), and the work becomes an extremely personal one: the expression of *el hombre que sentía*. *Impresiones de un viaje*, moreover, was not to be published until July 19, when it appeared in No. 141 of the *Revista Mensajero*. Between the notice of Larra's letter (May 24) and the publication of *Impresiones de un viaje*, five other articles by the author were to appear,⁷ so that in view of this backlog of works yet to be printed, Larra would know that *Fígaro en Lisboa*, if completed and sent to press in May, would not be published before June at the earliest.

What seems even more likely, however, is that the word *junio* was a mere slip of the pen. Larra, perhaps writing hurriedly in the hope of finishing both *Impresiones de un viaje* and *Fígaro en Lisboa* in time to get them into the post with his letter of May 16 before his departure for London on the 17th, seems to have written *junio* for *mayo* in a moment of absent-mindedness, as he had written *mayo* for *abril* at the end of the article just quoted—that is, only two paragraphs before the initial one of *Fígaro en Lisboa*, granting that he went on to the sequel immediately upon completing *Impresiones*

⁶ *Obras completas de Fígaro*, Paris, Garnier Hermanos, n. d., II, 412-419.

⁷ These were: *Las antigüedades de Mérida—Segundo y último artículo* (No. 91, May 30; the first part had appeared in No. 82, May 22), *Los calaveras—Artículo primero* (No. 94, June 2), *Los calaveras—Artículo segundo y conclusión* (No. 97, June 5), *Modos de vivir que no dan de vivir* (No. 121, June 29), and *La caza* (No. 128, July 6).

de un viaje. There he says, in the next to the last paragraph, describing his crossing into Portugal: "Era el 27 de mayo." But we know that it was the 27th of April, for on that date he wrote a letter to his father informing him that he was leaving for Lisbon that morning, and on May 27 he writes again from London.⁸

Fígaro en Lisboa has nothing to do with Lisbon or with Portugal. It was certainly not intended to be one of Larra's projected articles on that country.⁹ Lacking as it does a final polishing, its interest and importance lie in its intimate and personal nature. In it Fígaro explains the political reasons why it was necessary for him to begin his literary career with *artículos de costumbres*. He defends his past conduct as a liberal and evinces an almost pathological need to explain his present situation, his *actual moderación*, and his decision to revert to the production of *artículos de costumbres*. And in it is clearly to be seen the growing pessimism which, renewed and intensified, was ultimately to culminate in the suicide of 1837. The article is as follows:

Fígaro en Lisboa—Adiós a la patria.

Último artículo

¡Costumbres! otra vez! Costumbres y siempre costumbres! ¿Quién le ha dicho a Fígaro que puede importarle al público madrileño de Junio de 1835 ni el bosquejo de sus costumbres que sabe él mejor que el que se las viene a contar, ni las observaciones de sus viajes, ni. . . Linda ocasión! Cuando nuestras líneas se retiran sobre el Ebro, cuando la desgracia o el error acumulan sobre esta pobre patria todos los males de la guerra civil, hablarnos de costumbres y de viajes! Si al menos nos renovara algunos de sus artículos mordaces, si tomase como otras veces por tema de sus boletines los descuidos, la mala fe, el atraso, la desconfianza injusta . . . si los salpimentase con esas alusiones políticas, alimento del siglo, del país, que las circunstancias reclaman, y que llenan todas las conversaciones . . . !!! Vaya!

—No desconozco estas razones; no desecho la ocasión de responder a esos cargos, por si alguno me los hace: y antes ya los hubiera satisfecho a no ser porque para llevar a cabo esta idea era preciso ocuparse en uno mismo y ocupar en uno a los lectores ¿y dónde está el hombre, que puede, sin riesgo de parecer vano y ridículo entretener de sí mismo a sus lectores? Pero como al fin alguna vez conviene aclarar cada cual su modo de pensar, de escribir, de proceder, lo haré una por todas, y seré breve.

⁸ Both letters are reproduced by Carmen de Burgos, *op. cit.*, pp. 174-176.

⁹ Among his papers is Larra's outline of a projected series of five articles on Portugal. See Tarr, *op. cit.*, n. 71.

Cuando empecé la difícil carrera de escritor público, empecé con artículos de costumbres. Era a la sazón Calomarde [word omitted] y todo el mundo sabe en qué términos y hasta donde le era entonces lícito, posible al escritor revelarse [sic] contra el poder, aludir a la injusticia. A poder de reticencias, haciendo concesiones, podía uno alguna vez ser atrevido; siempre que pude fui más que atrevido, fui temerario, y completé catorce números de un folleto, mitad mío, mitad del Gobierno; entonces el Gobierno escribía por medio de sus censores la mitad de las obras que veían la luz; un folleto de dos ingenios, si se puede llamar ingenio a la censura, si es que ésta puede tener algo de común con aquél.

Los sucesos de la Granja vinieron poco después a alterar la monotonía de nuestra esclavitud y a resucitar todas las esperanzas nuestras. En un largo espacio de tiempo los partidos asombrados de un suceso que ninguno esperaba, permanecieron uno enfrente de otro, como contemplando la fuerza del enemigo, sin atreverse a acometerse, y como dos perros igualmente faltos de resolución que gruñen por lo bajo anunciando un próximo rompimiento: la falta de ánimo de unos y otros dió lugar a una especie de justo medio que vista la falta de energía de ambos contrincantes se creyó dueño de la mayoría y que empezó a reinar: entonces apareció Cea, y Cea reynó porque nadie se le opuso: la cuestión política estaba reducida entonces a cuestión mera de sucesión, de familia, de nombres propios y éste fué el objeto del famoso manifiesto. Los absolutistas, vieron que habían dado lentos y esperaron la suya; los liberales vieron que habían dado más lentos todavía, y quisieron resarcir ya tarde el tiempo perdido. Nacieron periódicos, pero el garrote antiguo que no había hecho más que pasar de una mano a otra y que antes sólo daba palos a un partido, comenzó a darlos a los dos y todos callaron y esperaron. Nadie era todavía poderoso en España sino los abusos y entre ellos los cómicos eran las más poderosas, porque impetraban y lograban reales órdenes para que no se les juzgase. La autoridad recelosa sin duda de que aquél que empezaba por el teatro podía muy bien acabar por otra cosa, sacrificaba la imprenta¹⁰ a las intrigas de bastidor; y entonces Fígaro, que nació, se hizo un pequeño lugar en las periódicos y acometió el abuso poderoso. Luchó contra los abusos de bastidor y triunfó. A despecho de las órdenes, se burló de ellas y de los cómicos protegidos.

El partido absolutista creyó de allí a poco ver la suya: sucedió un momento de crisis; un momento en que pudiera haber triunfado, si su jefe hubiera sido un hombre, al mismo tiempo que jefe: en aquel momento una de las primeras voces que se oyeron fué la de Fígaro y bien o mal como pudo, se aplicó a poner en ridículo al partido renaciente, la fantasma absolutista: a este puntito se había convertido entonces todo el compromiso, todo el peligro; ahí se puso Fígaro por consiguiente y arrojó el compromiso y el peligro, despreciado el partido de las insurrecciones, caído el déspota portugués, lanzado su compañero de esperanzas de la península, proclamado

¹⁰ Here my photostat ends, and the manuscript copy, made by a copyist in Madrid and corrected by Mr. Tarr, begins.

el tratado cuádruple, que entonces fué creído y tenido en algo, parecía ya una cobardía reírse del caído, del desesperanzado, del prófugo. Entonces cesan los artículos de Fígaro contra el pretendiente. Los liberales se reunieron y creyendo ver el mal principal, el error funesto a la patria en el miedo injusto que se les tenía contemplando la importuna clemencia viendo ocuparse en momentos preciosos a su gobierno del traje de los próceres, y negándose a las exigencias de la representación nacional al poder se creó una oposición, oposición entonces peligrosa, puesto que sucumbieron en ella amigos nuestros, jóvenes de ilustración y hombres injustamente sospechados. Cayeron periódicos, se firmaron destierros. En la oposición pues se reasumió todo el peligro, y allí Fígaro por consiguiente.

Explicada ya la clave de la marcha de Fígaro ¿a quién podrá extrañar que se lance en las costumbres, que se aparta de las alusiones políticas, de los artículos malignos, en el día en que fuera de su patria por circunstancias particulares y disgustos privados, ningún peligro había para él en escribir contra un partido que impone miedo, o contra el poder desviado a su entender del mejor, del único camino? ¿No sería una cobardía acometer desde París a los poderosos de España? ¿No lo sería mayor acometer a los carlistas? ¿Dónde estaría el peligro? ¿Dónde para Fígaro el compromiso? ¿No sería esto insultar al toro desde la barrera?

He aquí la razón de mi actual moderación: no se le busque otra. No es, pues, que falte materia; y si Fígaro se pudiera creer con alguna importancia, si su voz pudiera tener eco en el punto mismo de donde partiese, largo asunto tendría para esgrimir su pluma en otros gobiernos que en el español: en aliados peores que enemigos; larga materia en hombres que han desconocido las circunstancias, en políticos niños, en hombres del todo inocentes, que han creído poder despedir a los amigos antiguos en obsequios de los nuevos con que contaban, y que han perdido torpemente los unos y los otros. En una palabra, el perro que ha perdido la carne por la sombra de la carne y que preferirá ahora mendigar de puerta en puerta, de casa extraña en casa extraña, a confesar su error, a volver a su familia, a poner en contribución sus verdaderos, sus únicos, sus primeros amigos, los únicos que podían serlo, porque eran los únicos que tenían interés en serlo: que prefieren el desdoro general, y el desaire recibido en común, a su humillación personal. Y en este sentido si Fígaro entrevió algún peligro para él, si tiene alguna cosa que sacrificar, si puede quejarse de poderosos bajo cuya influencia se halle en el día, escribiría algún artículo mordaz antes de soltar la pluma por largo tiempo.

En el ínterin volvamos a nuestros artículos menos importantes.

JOHN KENNETH LESLIE

Northwestern University

EARLY USE OF THE LYRIC MONOLOGUE IN FRENCH
DRAMA OF THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

The history of the lyric monologue, or *stances*,¹ in the French drama of the seventeenth century has never been fully treated; in recent times (bare mention of it is made before the twentieth century)² the subject has been discussed by Dr. Werner Mulertt³ and by Professor H. Carrington Lancaster.⁴ The latter's illuminating article discounts any possible origin from the Greek chorus or from the Spanish sonnet-monologue, as Dr. Mulertt, among others, has proposed. Investigation shows that the lyric monologue is, as Professor Lancaster suggests, an outgrowth of the freedom in verse forms already prevalent in the tragi-comedies and pastorals of the sixteenth century. Such metrical departures from the prevailing meter as songs, letters, oracles and dialogues were not uncommon, and early in the seventeenth century the lyric monologue manifested itself as another "free" verse form.⁵ More than to any other impetus, the form of the lyric monologue is due to an equation made between it and the prevailing type of poetry known simply as "Stances"; stanzas written in honor of someone or in

¹ This term was not applied to the lyric monologue until 1630, in Mareschal's *Généreuse Allemande, seconde journée*, iv, 8.

² By La Mesnardière, d'Aubignac and Corneille in the seventeenth century, and by Voltaire and La Motte in the eighteenth. Cf. H. C. Lancaster, "The Origin of the Lyric Monologue in French Classical Tragedy," *PMLA*, vol. 42 (1927).

³ "Die lyrischen monologe in dem Dramen Pierre Corneilles und seiner Zeitgenossen," Herrig's *Archiv*, 1922 and 1923.

⁴ See note 2. Cf. also his *French Dramatic Literature in the Seventeenth Century*, Part V (s. v. *stances*). *Stances* are mentioned briefly in an interesting discussion on the general use of metrical departures from the alexandrine couplet in the French classical theater by René Bray, "L'Introduction des *vers mêlés* sur la scène classique," *PMLA*, vol. 66 (1951).

⁵ René Bray would classify these departures from the alexandrine couplet as *vers mêlés* (a term designating "le mélange des mètres et le désordre formel de leur disposition") as opposed to the *vers lyrique* ("qui souvent lui aussi mêle les mètres et les rimes, [mais] le fait suivant un schème déterminé et préétabli, qui se répète d'un bout à l'autre du poème"). He finds that "l'usage des stances [the lyric monologue] renforçait les positions du vers lyrique." *Op. cit.*, p. 462.

celebration of some event were very common and popular during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

From the history of the lyric monologue in the first third of the century it seems that an identity was often made between these "Stances" and the *stances* of the lyric monologue. An intermediary stage is evidenced as early as 1610; in *les Amours contraires* there is a dialogue that is sung, but when the play was rewritten as the *Vengeance des satyres* (published in 1614), we find an alteration, for, after the line

Chantons chacun un air, et puis dormons apres

is added this couplet:

Mais au lieu de chanter recitons quelque stance,
Car ie n'ay point de voix.—Ie le veux bien, commence.*

The lines that follow are, then, recited, although they are not the *stances* of the lyric monologue, since they constitute a dialogue. Scudéry, later on, called one of his lyric monologues a "villanelle" in a play containing three other lyric monologues, all called *stances* (*le Fils supposé*, 1636), and he and Du Ryer used the term *stances* as the heading of strophes both in a dialogue and in a monologue;⁷ Gougenot, in his *Comédie des Comédiens* (1633), calls several poems as well as the verses of the lyric monologue *stances*, the latter being the first parody of the lyric monologue in a French play. A reverse procedure is to be noted with Pichou, whose lyric monologue in *l'Infidèle Confidante* (1631) was later incorporated as "Stances" among the *Autres Œuvres poétiques du sieur Pichou*. This inconsistency in the use of the term *stances* has led theorists like Mulertt and M. Jarry⁸ to refer to *stances* as any metrical departure from the alexandrine couplet, whether in a monologue or not.

* Lancaster, *op. cit.*, Part I, 73.

⁷ Du Ryer entitles *stances* strophes not in a monologue in his *Argénis et Potiarque* (1630) and gives the same heading to the lyric monologue in his *Cléomédon* (1636), III, 1. Scudéry calls the lyric monologue *stances* in his *Orante* (1635), I, 5 and II, 1, and also calls *stances* strophes not in a monologue in his *le Prince déguisé* (1635), II, 5. Of the latter *stances*, Scudéry says: 'Tous les hommes suivaient cette pièce partout où elle se représentait, les dames en savaient les stances par cœur.' (Cf. Charles Clerc, *La vie tragi-comique de Scudéry*, Paris, 1929, p. 106.)

⁸ *Essai sur les Œuvres Dramatiques de Jean Rotrou*, Paris, 1868, p. 37.

The resemblance of the lyric monologue to songs has led to some erroneous conclusions. In his theory of the origin of *stances*—from the chorus to the monologue—Mulerdt maintains that it was but a short step to pass from the song of several persons to that of one, citing the use of both in Racan's *Bergeries*. It must be noted, however, that there are no *stances* of the lyric monologue in the *Bergeries*—Mulerdt is referring to the *chansons* to be found therein. Probably influenced by Rigal,⁹ Mulerdt sponsored the theory that Pichou (in his *Folies de Cardenio*, 1629) was the first to employ the stanzaic monologue as recited, not sung, and believed that the lyric monologue was first called *stances* in Scudéry's *Ligdamon et Lidias* (1631).¹⁰ The first example of the lyric monologue, however, occurred as early as 1610, in Billard's *Genevre*.¹¹ From both external and internal evidence, it hardly seems likely that *stances* were ever sung. D'Aubignac and Corneille refer to them as being recited¹² and the couplet already cited from the *Vengeance des satyres* distinguishes between singing an air and reciting "quelque stance"; and Bridard, in his pastoral *Uranie* (1631), also distinguishes between "chanson" and *stances*; in III, 2, Lisidor sings a song, and following this, in the same scene, he recites *stances*, which are so called.

Several general observations may be offered concerning the lyric monologue in the works of minor authors in the first third of the seventeenth century. It began to assert itself as an accepted *genre* first in pastorals and romantic tragi-comedies, and after appearing sporadically from 1610, became firmly established in the French theater during the apogee of the pastoral, between the years 1627 and 1631.¹³ As an indication of its popularity among the authors

⁹ Petit de Julleville's *Histoire de la langue et de la littérature française*, IV, 223, 224.

¹⁰ Cf. above, note 1.

¹¹ Lancaster, *op. cit.*, Part I, p. 24.

¹² D'Aubignac, however, feels that the nature of *stances*, considered as lyrical verses, warrants their being sung. "En un mot, les Stances sont . . . propres à chanter avec des instruments de musique." (Martino, *D'Aubignac, Pratique du théâtre*, Paris, 1927, p. 263.)

¹³ "Seven out of twenty-five plays that were brought out in 1628 and 1629 show lyric monologues. Nearly half the pastorals, tragi-comedies and comedies of the five years that followed contain them, though the tragedies of these years are without them." Lancaster, *PMLA*, vol. 42 (1927), p. 787.

of this period and for several years following, it may be noted that the lyric monologue was used in three plays by Pichou, Rayssiguier and Mareschal, in four plays by Du Ryer, and in seven plays by Scudéry. (Rotrou and Corneille each used the lyric monologue in eleven plays.) Bazire d'Amblainville, in his *Arlette*, published in 1638 but "played years before,"¹⁴ composed a lyric monologue of twenty strophes (in II, 5), and in Monléon's *l'Amphytrite* (1630) we find four examples of *stances*, two in the same scene (III, 2). Tragedy was the last *genre* to adopt the lyric monologue; Corneille's *Médée* represents practically the first time in the seventeenth century that *stances* were used in a French tragedy;¹⁵ Corneille's action led Rotrou, Tristan, La Calprenède and others to do the same thing in their tragedies of 1635-1636.

The lyric monologue seems to have been used solely as ornamentation for it reveals little or no psychological character development and generally does not serve the action of the play. A well-known exception is, of course, the famous *stances* of Rodrigue in *le Cid*, which contain a stirring soul-struggle that leads to the main action of the play. The lyric monologue assumed a definite pattern, not in form, but in subject matter; that of a lament (indeed, *stances* were often entitled "plainte"). *Stances* rarely occur at the beginning or end of a play and they are generally not long. The reciter of *stances* is often pictured in a solitary, deserted place, whether in the midst of *cavernes* and *bois*, or in a prison, or even in a monastery. He usually calls upon the elements of nature to witness his misfortunes, which he exaggerates to the degree of considering them superior to the woes that have befallen any other man, and often concludes by threatening to commit suicide. Sometimes we find a person, or persons, concealed, listening to the lyric monologue.¹⁶ There is no standard form that prevails for each example of *stances*, although the favorite verse used in the laments is the octosyllabic, generally found with at least one twelve-syllable line. A common formalization would have detracted from their novelty and caused, perhaps, their eclipse from the French scene at an

¹⁴ Lancaster, *French Dramatic Literature in the Seventeenth Century*, Part I, p. 401.

¹⁵ "The only case that might be considered an exception is furnished by the prayer in Billard's *Henry Quatre* (published in 1612)." *Ibid.*, II, 32.

¹⁶ Pichou's *les Folies de Cardénio*, IV, 6 and *Filis de Scire*, III, 6; Rotrou's *Célimène*, I, 2.

earlier date than when they began to disappear with Racine. D'Aubignac realized the importance of their novelty when he attributed their success partly "par l'humeur des François qui s'ennuyent des plus belles choses quand elles ne sont point variees, et qui ne desirent que les nouvelles, et les bizarreries portant quelque apparence de nouveauté."¹⁷ With its treatment at the hands of Rotrou, the lyric monologue lost some of its pastoral conventionality and became a charming poem which, while still retaining a plaintive tone, often suggests a mental conflict; and with Corneille we find examples of *stances* which are both moving and beautiful, with whom, indeed, the lyric monologue was lyric not only in form but also in inspiration.

GUSTAVE W. ANDRIAN

Trinity College, Hartford

A BATTLE OF BOOKS: PIERRE RICHELET AND AMELOT DE LA HOUSSAYE

The quarrel between Richelet and Amelot de la Houssaye has not been examined, although it is unique to find a dictionary of the French language and a history of the Roman empire employed as vehicles for violent exchanges between writers dedicated to presumably impersonal categories of literary endeavor. The cause of the hostility between the lexicographer and the translator originated in Richelet's hopes of becoming *sousprécepteur* to the Dauphin in 1669. Tallemant des Réaux had proposed him to Perigny, the *précepteur*; however, président Nicolaï intervened in behalf of Jean Doujat, and Richelet was obliged to find other means of livelihood.¹ He bore his disappointment gracefully: no reference is made to the affair in the first edition of his *Dictionnaire François* (1679-80), and Amelot de la Houssaye is not among the individuals attacked. The quarrel began in earnest when the latter published his *Tacite, avec des notes politiques et historiques* (1690). He accused Richelet of presumption in claiming friendship with de Perigny, labelled him "le Calepin des laquais et des garces," and lashed out at

¹⁷ Martino, *op. cit.*, p. 262.

¹ Michaud, *Biographie Universelle*, Paris, Vivès, n. d., xxxv, 612; *idem.*, Paris, Michaud, 1814, xi, 616.

... le Dictionnaire que Richelet a fait pour l'instruction, ou plutôt pour la corruption de ceux qui ne savent pas les termes que l'honnêteté civile, la pudeur, la bienséance ont bannis de la conversation.²

Infuriated, Richelet composed epigrams³ and supplemented his assault in the first revision of his dictionary. Thus, there is no reference to Amelot de la Houssaye in the first edition of the *Dictionnaire François*, but the revised version of 1694 contains forty-five slurs. The three additional remarks after *rame*, *rapsodie*, *torche-cu* in the posthumous editions of 1713 and 1730 are apparently taken from Richelet's notes, and the lexicographer's rage may therefore be described as virulent enough to have grown in death.

The entries for *Bureau des pauvres*, *case*, *se cicatiser*, *culote*, *fanatique*, *grêlé*, *guérison*, *lunatique*, *patibulaire*, *practicable*, *rencontrer*, and *valet* afforded Richelet opportunity to assail in prose Amelot's appearance, habits, and intelligence; an effort in verse completes the portrait as well as illustrating "sens":

C'est un nazilleur, un magot,
Un misantrophe, chimérique
De corps et d'esprit très ragot.
Un misérable hypocritique,
A qui le bon sens fait la nique;
Et pour l'achever en un mot,
Un franc animal politique
Qui sent la hard et le fagot.

Since Perrot d'Ablancourt, friend and collaborator of Richelet, had also translated Tacitus, it is not surprising that the lexicographer should deprecate Amelot's authorship. This aspect of the onslaught may be measured when it is realized that twenty-six definitions were bent to this purpose⁴ in addition to two other entries, *caquesangue* and *torche-cu*, which are probably the most scabrous entries in the realm of lexicography; the second of these

² Cf. Willem Van Der Wijk, *La Première Edition du Dictionnaire François de Richelet*, Dordrecht, Naber, 1923, 13.

³ Frédéric Lachèvre, *Bibliographie des Recueils Collectifs de Poésies*, Paris, Leclère, 1904, III, 505-506.

⁴ *Adversaire*, *aficher*, *amende*, *antérieur*, *apocriphe*, *apogée*, *aprenti*, *beau*, *beaucoup*, *bousilleur*, *cabrer*, *camouflet*, *capacité*, *épicier*, *fade*, *insipide*, *inventu*, *purisme*, *redondance*, *tapis*, *vers*, *vie*, *vieux*, *vif*, *village* (sic), *visionnaire*.

contains a *Quatrain sur le Tacite d'Amelot de la Houssaye* that is beyond description. The most elaborate jibe is included after *mettre à la rame*, which may serve to furnish a final idea of Richelet's mordacity:

Amelot pensa devenir tout-à-fait fou lorsqu'il aprit qu'on alloit mettre son Tacite à la Rame. Comment! S'écria-t-il, tout furieux, ah quel revers de fortune! Me mettre à la rame, moi que des sots flatoient de l'avoir emporté sur d'Ablancourt. A la rame, moi qui depuis vingt ans nourris la Librairie; moi, l'adorateur forcené des Libraresses de la rue Saint Jaques. Ingrats coquins, est-ce ainsi qu'on reconnoit mes peines, mes bontez, et mon amour. Quoi, me mettre à la rame et me faire aller avec Charpentier, Vaumorière et Tomas de Lormes chez l'épicier et la beurrière. Cet affront me tue. J'en meurs de rage et de déplaisir; et n'ai le tems que de recommander mon âme à Dieu et mon épitaphe à l'obligeant Mr. Pinsson.

SPIRE PITOU

Marquette University

"MY BROTHER'S KEEPER"—STANISLAUS JOYCE
AND "FINNEGANS WAKE"

To the many-sided picture of James Joyce—the shy man, the arrogant man, the convivialist, the paterfamilias, the uncrowned Pope, the persecuted priest, the crucified artist, the great man—we must now add Stanislaus Joyce's picture of his brother as the perpetual wayward son.¹ To many people Joyce seemed to have been an enigma, but his brother's sketch is classic in its simplicity: James Joyce was a "bad boy" who sometimes did and sometimes did not respond to the admonitions of Stanislaus, who in turn was both moral and artistic conscience and authority for his wavering brother.

Stanislaus' disapproval of his brother was two-fold: first, James drank too much; second, his later writing was incomprehensible. Nor were these passive observations—Stanislaus was a lecturer, a hectorer, in short, the father to the erring child. At Trieste, "He (James) still had the same intemperate habits, and I set about

¹ Stanislaus Joyce: *Recollections of James Joyce* (trans., Ellsworth Mason), New York, 1950. Also published (trans., Felix Giovanelli) in *The Hudson Review* II (Winter, 1950), 485-514.

deliberately to break him of them." "At last I succeeded in my intent; he became abstemious." But after the war, "his intemperance had become greater than ever." This time Stanislaus refused to attempt to "cure" him, and he felt that his brother had "let him down." Giving up custodianship of his brother's morals, Stanislaus still remained guardian of his art and wrangled with him over *Finnegans Wake*—" . . . what is the good if the word ceases to be the vehicle of thought"; "Then Joyce went to Paris, and I saw him only rarely." And when his brother sent him a copy of the published work, "I refused it," although naturally he later regretted the refusal.

Yet James Joyce seems to have anticipated this indictment and to have answered it with loving irony, for on p. 237 of *Finnegans Wake* there occurs the following passage:

"—Enchanted, dear sweet Stainusless, young confessor, dearer dearest, we herehear, aboutobloss, O coelicola, thee salutamt. Pattern of our unschoold, pageantmaster, deliverer of softmissives, round the world in forty mails, bag, belt and balmybeam, our barnaboy, our chepachap, with that pampipe in your putaway, gab borab, when you will be after doing all your sight-seeing and sound-hearing and smellsniffing and tastytasing and tenderumstouchings in all Daneygaul, send us, your adorables, thou overblaseed, a wise and letters play of all you can ceive, chief celtech chappy, from your holy post now you hast ascertained ceremonially our names. Unclean you art not. Outcaste thou are not. Leperstower, the karman's loki, has not blanched at our pollution and your intercourse at ninety legsplits does not defile. Untouchable is not the scarecrow is on you. You are pure. You are pure. You are in your puerity. You have not brought stinking members into the house of Amanti. Elleb Inam, Titep, Notep, we name them to the Hall of Honour. Your head has been touched by the god Enel-Rah and your face has been brightened by the goddess Aruc-Ituc. Return, sainted youngling, and walk once more among us!"

By general context and by particular phraseology it seems unmistakable that this is Joyce's characterization of his brother and a statement about the relationship between the two. The large context of the quotation is Chapter I, Book II of *Finnegans Wake*, the book which Campbell and Robinson² call "The Book of the

² Campbell and Robinson: *A Skeleton Key to 'Finnegans Wake,'* New York, 1944, p. 141.

Sons." The sons are the eternal set of antitheses, Shem and Shaun, only here they are known as Glugg (Shem) and Chuff (Shaun). Shem or Glugg, the artist, the rebel, the sensualist, the worldly failure is James Joyce himself. Shaun (Chuff), the citizen, the virtuous, law-abiding, and successful man, is, in this instance anyway, Stanislaus. Glugg is "the bold, bad, bleak boy of the story-books"; Chuff is "the fine, frank, fairhaired fellow of the fairytales, who wrestles for tophole with the bold, bad, bleak boy Glugg."

According to Campbell and Robinson, upon whose account of the major movements in this chapter I am leaning heavily, the outline of the action is as follows: "Chapter I is presented as a play given by the children before their parents. The outline is simple enough. Glugg is thrice tempted to adventures which he cannot accomplish: first by a game of charades, next by a coy little note, and finally by a sign that carries his mind to 'the house of breathings.' Each of his failures results in a dance of triumph of the girls around Chuff, and in an excess of black bile within his own unhappy soul. First he swears to himself the three Oaths of Exile, Silence, and Cunning; next he shows repentance; but he confesses his father's and mother's sins instead of his own; finally, he indulges in sinful lustful thoughts. Whereupon the valiant Chuff makes at him, and they wrestle until the voice of the father summons them home."³

In other words Glugg (James) is sinful and frustrated, while Chuff (Stanislaus) is virtuous, and applauded. Finally they wrestle, but the match is broken up and reaches no definite conclusion.

More particularly, the passage quoted above is chanted to Chuff by the little dancing girls (there are twenty-eight of them), and it is significant that the chant occurs in one of the loveliest parts of the book, as the girls blend with flowers and with sun to begin their paean of praise to Chuff. But, of course, Joyce wouldn't be Joyce if he didn't allow himself a Rabelaisian element, and so when the girls turn toward Chuff, he finds that the sun is so bright that "he can eyespy through them, to their selfcolours . . . (O my goodmiss! O my greatness! O my prizelestly preshoes!)"

Now, of course, the meaning of this passage in the context of the relationship between Joyce and his brother is clear. The key is given at the beginning, in the initial salutation: "Stainless" "en-

³ *Ibid.*, p. 142.

chains" those of lesser virtue ("At last I succeeded in my intent; he became abstemious"): "young confessor," "You are pure. You are pure." and, allowing himself an irony, "You are in your puerity." And yet, all the while, Stanislaus is "enchanted," and since James was in Paris at the time and Stanislaus in Trieste ("Then Joyce went to Paris, and I saw him only rarely"), Joyce asks his brother to come to him again: "Return, sainted youngling, and walk once more among us!"

Thus with a mixture of mockery and affection, in the setting of a children's play and chanted by a chorus of little sun-flower girls, Joyce gives his final benediction to his brother—the guilty forgiving the innocent. One is struck, naturally, by the humor and whimsicality of James' version of the relationship, as contrasted to the sombre and austere account of his brother, although it is quite evident that they are both talking about the same thing and Shem-Glugg-James is the "bold, bad, bleak boy" in both versions.

Certainly it would seem that each brother was in the nature of being a cross for the other to bear. Stanislaus was not being "holier than thou" when he dragged his reluctant brother from Italian barrooms and back to his wife and children, always, in the early days, on the verge of starvation. On the other hand, his attempt to dictate his brother's esthetic would seem to be presumptuous, and certainly, in purely psychological terms, a super-virtuous brother is a difficult thing to cope with. But wherever the burdens of guilt may fall, the moral would seem to be this: that it is infinitely easier for the guilty to forgive the innocent for the presumption of proffered guidance than it is for the innocent to forgive the guilty for not taking that guidance.

JOHN HENRY RALEIGH

University of California, Berkeley

LEOPOLD BLOOM BEFORE 'ULYSSES'

Though James Joyce's friendship with Italo Svevo, the acknowledged model for the Leopold Bloom of *Ulysses*, had scarcely begun in 1904-1905, Joyce in those years sketched a character for his *Dubliners* who possesses many of the attributes of Bloom. The character of Mr. M'Coy in the story "Grace" is so strikingly similar

to Bloom as to suggest that Joyce may have been experimenting consciously to find the right formula for his Greek hero. Padraic Colum adduces the evidence also that Joyce originally intended Bloom to be the hero of a tale.

As he appears in "Grace," M'Coy has the same relationship to his associates as Bloom was to have later. Like Bloom, "He had been . . . a canvasser for advertisements for . . . *The Freeman's Journal*."¹ M'Coy is the submissive one in a discussion, a hanger-on, isolated from true companionship. Mr. Power is annoyed when M'Coy has the audacity to call him by his Christian name² and ignores him as Lawyer Menton ignores Bloom's overtures of friendship in the Hades episode.³ He plays up to the prejudices of his companions in order to win their good will, agreeing with Mr. Kernan that the Irish police are ignorant yahoos.⁴

Even M'Coy's willingness to efface himself does not win close friendship; rather it gains him merely toleration. His feeling of apartness and loneliness probably reaches its height when, in the Jesuit Church, he finds himself on a bench alone: "Mr. M'Coy had tried unsuccessfully to find a place in the bench with the others."⁵ In these situations, if the name "Bloom" had been substituted for "M'Coy," the reader would have found no inconsistency in the characterization.

Further evidence supports this view. Bloom's hazy interest in science is found also in M'Coy. The one point on which the latter brooks no challenge is a scientific question. He insists on his explanation of the role of thorax in Mr. Kernan's cold.⁶ Moreover, M'Coy's wife is a soprano, like Molly Bloom, who makes concert tours.⁷ Urged by his delight in the ironic *tour de force*, perhaps, Joyce introduced in *Ulysses* both M'Coy, the early sketch, and the more mature conception, Bloom himself. He even brought them face to face at key points.⁸ Significantly, although Bloom is over-anxious to meet almost all Dubliners, he avoids M'Coy and tries to "get rid of him quickly."⁹ The picture is created of Bloom,

¹ James Joyce, *Dubliners*, New York, Random House (1926), p. 201.

² *Ibid.*, p. 203.

³ James Joyce, *Ulysses*, New York, Random House, 1934, p. 114.

⁴ Joyce, *Dubliners*, p. 205.

⁷ *Ibid.*

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 219-220.

⁸ Joyce, *Ulysses*, p. 72.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 201.

⁹ *Ibid.*

who strives continually to break out of his loneliness, refusing fellowship to a likeness of himself.

Ulysses was published in 1922; "Grace" was written before 1906. If the M'Coy-Bloom parallel is more than accidental—and it seems to be—then it helps to date Joyce's fascination with the gigantic figure of Bloom.

MARVIN MAGALANER

The City College of New York

"NEW POEMS" OF EMILY DICKINSON

One of the fascinating problems that should be cleared up in the new edition¹ of Emily Dickinson's works is the exact relation of the poems to the letters. Whicher says that "some of the pieces included in her *Poems* were, in fact, bits of letters written as prose."² One of these "bits" appears first as follows as part of a letter written in 1872: "Thank you for the passage. How long to live the truth is! A word is dead when it is said, some say. I say it just begins to live that day."³ It might be said that the first editors were justified in making a poem out of the last part of this passage because the writer obviously intended that part as a poem. But dozens of new poems of Emily Dickinson could be found in this manner in the letters. Here are a few prose passages that fall into characteristic verse patterns and that perhaps have as much justification as poems as the famous one just quoted.

"Then will I not repine/ knowing that bird of mine,/ though flown,/ learneth beyond the sea/ melody new for me,/ and will return." (Letter of 1853, p. 162)

"Affection is like bread,/ unnoticed till we starve,/ and then we dream of it,/ and sing of it,/ and paint it,/ when every urchin in the street/ has more than he can eat." (Letter of 1874, p. 276)

". . . could we see all we hope,/ or hear the whole we fear/ told tranquil, like another tale,/ there would be madness near." (Letter of 1874, p. 278)

¹ See announcement by the editor, Thomas H. Johnson, *New York Times Book Review*, August 20, 1950, p. 2.

² George F. Whicher, *This Was a Poet, A Critical Biography of Emily Dickinson* (New York, 1939), p. 144.

³ Mable Loomis Todd, *The Letters of Emily Dickinson* (Boston, 1894), p. 269. This passage, beginning with "A word is dead" (No. LXXXIX, *Poems of Emily Dickinson*, Boston, 1937, p. 42), was first published as a poem in the 1896 edition of the poems.

"The slips of the last rose/ of summer repose/ in kindred soil/ with waning bees for mates./ How softly summer shuts,/ without the creaking of a door,/ abroad for evermore." (Letter of 1880, p. 286)

If such "poems" occur in the prose of Emily Dickinson's letters, it is inaccurate to say, with Wells, "The prose letters to friends are in relatively grey, everyday tones, against which the lyrical letters to posterity stand out in flaming contrast."⁴ Whicher is closer to the truth when he speaks of "the probably unconscious verse" embedded in the prose (p. 178).⁵ Of this tendency to write verse instead of prose Johnson speaks as follows: "As Emily matured she was unable to write a letter without breaking into song. Letters that start out as prose shape themselves into epigrammatic stanzas. Not one of her later letters was strictly 'prose.'" While Johnson's statement is true, he seems to think of the tendency as a stylistic development of the poet's maturity, the implication being that her early letters do not show such a tendency. There is a contrast between the early and later letters, a contrast noted by Mrs. Todd as between "the diffuseness of girlhood and the brilliant sententiousness of late middle life" (p. vii). But the tendency to versify in prose is there from beginning to end.

Since the passages already quoted were selected because of their poetic quality, one more metrical, rhymed excerpt may be set down in order to show that some of these "poems" have little if any artistic value. The following passage is from a letter written to Emily's brother Austin before his visit home in the fall of 1851. It is difficult indeed here to assume the poet's unawareness of the pattern.

"... there is another sky,/ ever serene and fair,/ and there is another sunshine,/ though it be darkness there;/ never mind faded forests, Austin,/ never mind silent fields—/ *here* is a little forest,/ whose leaf is ever green;/ here is a brighter garden,/ where not a frost has been;/ in its unfading flowers/ I hear the bright bee hum;/ prithee, my brother,/ into *my* garden come!" (p. 97)

JOHN TYREE FAIN

University of Florida

⁴ Henry W. Wells, *Introduction to Emily Dickinson* (Chicago, 1947), p. 15.

⁵ On the poetic quality of Emily Dickinson's prose see also a note by Milton Hindus, *Kenyon Review*, II (1940), 88-91.

NEW LIGHT ON POE'S "THE MASQUE OF THE
RED DEATH"¹

One of the works that may have supplied Poe with raw materials for his *The Masque of the Red Death* appears to have been overlooked in the discussions of the backgrounds of that story. Thomas Campbell's *Life of Petrarch* was published in 1841 and Poe reviewed it in *Graham's* for September of that year (xix, 143-144), eight months before "The Masque" was published in the same periodical (xx, 257-259; May, 1842). Poe's critical remarks indicate at least a general familiarity with the contents of Campbell's book. The *Life* contains occasional passages which describe the effects of the great plague which swept through Italy in the mid-fourteenth century, and Poe chose from among these passages in selecting quotations for comment.

The descriptions of the plague in the two works show several points of correspondence in regard to the symptoms and effects of the disease. Moreover, an incident related by Campbell offers a striking parallel to the essentials of Poe's plot:

The plague now again broke out in Italy. . . . The nobles and court abandoned their capital, Galeazzo Visconti repaired to Monza, Barnabo shut himself in his strong castle at Manigno near Lodi, a place that was thought to be sheltered from pestilence by the dense woods around it. He had his retreat strictly guarded, allowing no one to approach it. A sentinel was placed in one of the towers, who had orders to ring the bell whenever he saw any one approaching on horseback. Some gentlemen entered the precincts of the castle without any one having heard the bell. Barnabo immediately sent orders to put the sentinel to death; but they found him dead beneath the bell. This event so frightened our chieftain, that he went and hid himself in the thickest depths of the forest, where he lived so sequestered as to cause a report of his death.²

This account of the attempt of an Italian nobleman to isolate himself from the plague-stricken world, permitting no one to enter his secluded castle, but finding his efforts futile against the power

¹ A list of previously suggested sources for Poe's story may be found in Cortell King Holsapple, "The Masque of the Red Death and *I Promessi Sposi*," University of Texas Studies in English, xviii, 137-139 (1938).

² Thomas Campbell, *Life of Petrarch*, London, 1841, II, 239-240.

of the pestilence,³ may have furnished Poe with all he required in the way of basic plot material for "The Masque."

As Poe does in "The Masque," Campbell tells of merrymakers who carried on their activities while the plague raged. He, however, unlike Poe, assigns a convincing medieval reason for such behavior:

It was the general persuasion that sadness accelerated the infection of the malady, and that pleasant amusements were the surest defence against it. People, therefore, hardened their hearts against grief for the dead by jokes and merriment. . . .

In the mean time, the living, being persuaded that diversions and songs of gaiety could alone preserve them from the pestilence, kept up their revels. . . .⁴

Prince Prospero and his "hale and light-hearted" company in "The Masque" unsympathetically seek a safe retreat where they can defy the plague, leaving the external world to "take care of itself." Poetic justice, for which Poe had respect, is much better served in the story by the omission of any reference to the motive which Campbell attributes to the pleasure seekers, as is the over-all tone of horror which Poe wanted to achieve.

JAMES B. REECE

Durham, N. C.

GASCOIGNE AND CHAUCER'S *PESEN*

Describing the battle of Actium in his legend of Cleopatra, Chaucer says:

He poureth pesen upon the haches slidere;
With pottes ful of lyme they gon togidere. (LGW 648-649)

Professor Skeat explained *pesen* as referring to parched peas which were poured on one's own decks to make them too slippery for boarders,¹ but the lack of an obvious source for Chaucer or of an exactly analogous situation in other works has caused the line to

³ While Campbell is not explicit on this point, the idea that the sentinel died of the plague would almost certainly have occurred to Poe.

⁴ Campbell, *op. cit.*, I, 353-354.

¹ W. W. Skeat ed., *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer* (Oxford, 1894), III, 312.

be considered a crux. Professor Schofield traced *pesen* to the French *pois*, which could mean either "peas" or "pitch," and showed that pitch was thrown on enemy decks to support Greek Fire.² That *pesen* was a scribal error for *resyn*, used to make one's own decks less slippery, was suggested by Professor Frank Mather,³ who was answered by Roland M. Smith who felt that *poureth pesen* was an alliterative phrase derived from a phrase like *lançoient de pieres* 'launch stones,' or possibly from the English word *peises* 'weights.'⁴ Professor Webster agreed with Skeat that the word meant "peas," but insisted that they were thrown on the enemy's decks, giving in support analogous situations in which grease, soft soap, and oil were thrown with the express purpose of making the enemy fall.⁵

The works cited by these writers in support of their theories indicate that a great many different things were thrown from the attacker's ship to incapacitate the enemy in one way or another: stones, iron bars, fire, as well as more familiar missiles such as arrows and bullets. In nearly every case lime pots, to blind the enemy, were thrown as well. But only in a few cases is anything mentioned which was designed specifically to make the enemy slip. Professor Webster's contributions, and the book by Christine de Pisan cited by both Mather and Smith, offer grease, soft soap, and oil. It has not been noticed that Caxton, in translating Christine, rendered her *mol sçavon* as "softe zande."⁶ In an otherwise careful and accurate translation, this appears strange unless we can accept the possibility that, in Caxton's day at least, soft sand was used for this purpose. In an early sixteenth-century textbook for sailors, Alfonso de Chaves lists among arms necessary aboard ship one hundred *alcancias*, or clay boxes, some filled with pitch or gunpowder (for fire) and others with soap, oil or lime. Describing their use, he says that those filled with soap and oil will cause

² William Henry Schofield, "The Sea-Battle in Chaucer's 'Legend of Cleopatra,'" *Kittredge Anniversary Papers* (Boston, 1913), pp. 139-152.

³ "Pesen at Actium—A Chaucer Crux," *JEGP*, XLIII (1944), 375-379.

⁴ "Action at Actium—An Alliterative Crux in Chaucer," *JEGP*, XLIV (1945), 56-61.

⁵ K. G. T. Webster, "Two Notes on Chaucer's Sea-Fight," *MP*, XXV (1928), 291-292.

⁶ Christine de Pisan, *The Book of Fayttes of Armes and of Chyvalrye*, trans. William Caxton (1490), ed. A. T. P. Byles, *EETS*, O. S. No. 189 (London, 1932 [corrected issue, 1937]), p. 184.

the enemy to slip, and those filled with lime will blind them.⁷ Both lime and liquid soap were used in this way in the battle of Meloria (1284).⁸

The references above are all to the practice of making the enemy slip on his own deck, but some of the Turks in the battle of Lepanto (1571) spread oil, honey and butter on their decks to make boarders slip.⁹ We note particularly here that the butter and honey, if not the oil, were undoubtedly not stowed for the purpose of warfare, but were part of the ship's regular provisions. That parched peas were also commonly carried on shipboard is indicated by de Chaves' list of provisions which includes *habas y garbanzos* 'broad beans and chick-peas' (p. 16).

To this background of information on devices for causing the enemy to slip either on his own or on the attacker's decks may be added a pair of lines from "Gascoignes devise of a maske for the right honorable Viscount Montacute" (1572).¹⁰ Describing the battle of Lepanto, he says:

The pots of lime unsleakt, from highest top are cast,
The parched peas are not forgot to make them slip as fast. (192-193)

Here, finally, we have an exact analogue to Chaucer's lines. The *pesen* are "parched," and their purpose is to make the enemy slip. Furthermore, they "gon togidere" with pots of lime. A comparison of the contexts of Chaucer's and Gascoigne's lines leads me to believe that Gascoigne was not copying his predecessor's description of the battle of Actium; even if he had been, he has added details which do not appear in Chaucer ("parched" and "to make them slip as fast") which must have come from another source. The work from which Gascoigne took most of his information for the

⁷ Cesáreo Fernández Duro, *De algunas obras desconocidas de cosmographia y de navagacion, y singularmente de la que escribió Alfonso de Chaves á principios del siglo XVI* (Madrid, 1895), pp. 18, 25.

⁸ William L. Rodgers, *Naval Warfare Under Oars* (Annapolis, Md., 1940), p. 132.

⁹ Ferrante Caracciolo, *I commentarii delle guerre fatte co' Turchi da D. Giovanni D'Austria, dopo che venne in Italia* (Firenze, 1581), p. 42.

¹⁰ George Gascoigne, *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowers*, ed. Charles T. Prouty, University of Missouri Studies, Vol. xvii, No. 2 (Columbia, Mo., 1942), pp. 172-181.

masque does not mention peas,¹¹ and until some other source is found we may entertain the idea that his own experience in two sea-battles provided him with the information.¹²

Gascoigne's lines do not clear up the syntax of Chaucer's "slidere." Although apparently an adjective modifying "haches," rather than the verb form "to make slippery or smooth" (*OED*), its sense is not clear, for if the hatches are already slippery, there seems little point in making them more so. The adjectival meaning "of a smooth or slippery nature" given in *OED* would make sense, however: "He pours peas on the smooth hatches" to make them slippery. Perhaps this interpretation will receive support from the new dictionary of Middle English.

W. TODD FURNISS

Ohio State University

THE SUMMONER AND HIS CONCUBINE

He wolde suffre for a quart of wyn
A good felawe to have his concubyn
A twelf month, and excuse hym atte fulle;
Ful prively a fynch eek koude he pulle.

—*Canterbury Tales* A 649-52

The final line of this passage, which consists chiefly of a slang expression, was long misunderstood. The explanation of it given by Tyrwhitt—"to strip a man, by fraud, of his money"—was accepted by succeeding editors, including Skeat, and is sanctioned by so respected an authority as the *OED*. More than forty years ago, however, Kittredge pointed out that the expression has another meaning, more applicable in this particular context, and adduced evidence for his interpretation that can hardly be questioned.¹

¹¹ See Robert Ralston Cawley, "George Gascoigne and the Siege of Famagusta," *MLN*, XLIII (1928), 296-300.

¹² See "Gascoignes voyage into *Hollande*, An. 1572," in *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowers*, pp. 187-195, and "The fruites of Warre," in *The Complete Works of George Gascoigne*, ed. John W. Cunliffe, Cambridge English Classics (Cambridge, Eng., 1907-10), I, 139-184.

¹ *MP*, VII (1910), 475-77.

Such editors as Koch, Manly, and Robinson have followed him in seeing in the line an allusion to fornication, not to fraud.²

Another matter of some interest is the reference of *his* in the second line of this passage. I have been unable to find any discussion of this specific point, but the usual interpretation seems to take *felawe* as the antecedent of the possessive pronoun. It may be, however, that it refers to *he* of the preceding line.³ Sentences containing such instances of pronominal ambiguity are by no means uncommon in English; for example, "Mr. Smith would not allow John to read his book after supper." It is altogether possible, then, that Chaucer is here telling his readers that the Summoner not only kept a mistress but that he also handed her over for a year to "a good felawe" in exchange for a quart of wine.⁴

The meaning of "excuse hym atte fulle," which concludes the

² The explanations of this line given in textbooks edited for use in undergraduate survey courses differ considerably. Hazelton Spencer, *British Literature from Beowulf to Sheridan* (Boston, 1951), p. 124, goes right to the point: "a slang phrase for illicit sexual intercourse; 'finch' = girl." Woods, Watt, and Anderson, *The Literature of England*, 3rd ed. (Chicago, 1947), I, 222, are somewhat vague: "a slang phrase of highly indecent nature." Lieder, Lovett, and Root, *British Poetry and Prose*, 3rd ed. (Boston, 1950), I, 107, follow Tyrwhitt in equating "pull a finch" with "fleece a gull."

³ Marchette Chute, *Geoffrey Chaucer of England* (New York, 1946), p. 256, hints at this when she writes of the Summoner: "He was indeed a 'good felawe'—the kind who would lend out his girl for a twelvemonth in exchange for a quart of wine." But she appears to identify the "good felawe" with the Summoner, a reading for which the text gives no support.

⁴ A similar ambiguity is to be found in modernizations of Chaucer. For example, Tatlock and MacKaye, *The Complete Poetical Works of Geoffrey Chaucer* (New York, 1912), pp. 11-12, have this rendering: "... for a quart of wine he would suffer a good fellow to have his paramour a twelvemonth and utterly wink at it, and privily he practised the same himself!" R. M. Lumiansky, *The Canterbury Tales of Geoffrey Chaucer* (New York, 1948), p. 11, translates: "For a quart of wine, he would allow a good fellow to have his mistress for a year, and excuse him fully. And he could pull the same trick quite expertly on someone else." A difficulty of a sort common in turning Chaucer into Modern English is evident here in the translation of "good felawe" by its verbal equivalent, which lacks the connotation of the original. It may be noted further that Manly and Robinson in the notes to their editions suggest that the "good felawe" was perhaps a priest who kept a concubine, but the text does not seem to warrant such a conclusion.

first clause of this passage, is also uncertain because of the twofold interpretation that can be put upon *hym*. This word is generally taken to be a personal pronoun, the direct object of *excuse*, with *felawe* as its antecedent, and so it may well be; in fact, this is the only possibility if these lines are read in the usual way. But *hym* may be reflexive, as the pronoun after the verb *excuse* often is in Chaucerian usage.⁵ If this is the case here, then the Summoner is to be thought of as maintaining his own innocence, not that of the "good felawe."

Another interpretation of line 652 is possible in the light of the reading here proposed for the three lines that precede it. The illicit intercourse in which the Summoner indulged may have gone on with his own concubine, even though he had given up all rights to her for a year. Such an explanation adds no little force to the sense of *ful prively*, and the adverb *EEK* would also seem to support it. Though she was by agreement not his for a time, the Summoner quite secretly continued to take his pleasure with her. And in so doing he gulled the "good felawe" who had given him a quart of wine. That Chaucer did not refrain from an occasional pun is well enough known,⁶ and it may be that he is here using the expression "pull a finch" in both of the senses that Kittredge recognizes.

While the Summoner was perhaps expected to keep up some semblance of respectability because of his connection with the ecclesiastical court, it is hard to believe from what Chaucer says of his appearance that anybody except the most naive was unaware of his way of life. As Curry diagnoses the case, the Summoner was suffering from alopecia, a disease perhaps confused in medieval medicine with syphilis and one frequently brought on by lechery.⁷ His rascality and his repulsiveness are evident before these lines are reached in Chaucer's portrait of him, and it may be that here the poet is subtly calling to mind an earlier comment—"As hoot he was and lecherous as a sparwe"—and also adding a detail to his character's unscrupulousness. In the sort of situation that is here suggested (somewhat tentatively, it must be confessed), it was

⁵ Cf. *CT* B 1059; *CT* D 391; *CT* I 586; *Tr* II, 12; *Tr* III, 561; *Tr* III, 810; etc.

⁶ Cf. J. S. P. Tatlock, "Puns in Chaucer," *Flügel Memorial Volume* (Stanford University, 1916), pp. 228-32.

⁷ *Chaucer and the Mediaeval Sciences* (New York, 1926), pp. 37 ff.

certainly necessary that the Summoner exercise the utmost secrecy. To have gone back on a bargain like this, to have drunk the wine and still kept the lady, would have made him an even blacker character, at least in the eyes of some of his associates, than he appears to be, for honor is said to exist even among thieves.

HENRY BOSLEY WOOLF

Louisiana State University

CHAUCEUR'S BLACK KNIGHT

Modern scholars tend, almost universally, to regard *The Book of the Duchess* as an elegy upon the death of Blanche, John of Gaunt's first wife and Duchess of Lancaster. Stow records the tradition for such an interpretation, and there is internal evidence as well—especially the allusion to Blanche in line 948 and the references to Lancaster and Richmond, Gaunt's Yorkshire seat, in lines 1318 and 1319. That the poem was prompted by the death of the wife of one of Chaucer's intimate acquaintances can scarcely be doubted, but perhaps historical criticism has overemphasized the indebtedness of the creative artist to a particular happening. It is, after all, the way of literary genius to utilize specific events as a source of inspiration for works of universal significance.

The Book of the Duchess may very well be a conventional exercise in the elegy form, using the love-vision as its basis—an elegy which alludes, in passing, to the death of Blanche, but which aims at a more generalized expression of the grief felt upon the loss of a loved one. The extreme artificiality of the work, its reliance upon literature rather than life, would tend to support this view. The long description of the lady, for example, is entirely conventional, and can be paralleled fully in the French sources, especially Machaut's *Roy de Behaingne*. More specific evidence can, however, be found in the portrait of the Black Knight himself, who is obviously not a literal representation of John of Gaunt. The Black Knight is pictured as a very youthful individual:

Of good mochel, and ryght yong therto,
Of the age of foure and twenty yer,
Upon hys berd but lytel her. (454-456) ¹

¹ In F. N. Robinson, ed., *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer* (Cambridge, Mass., 1933).

John of Gaunt was, of course, not twenty-four but twenty-nine when Blanche died.² This discrepancy has been rationalized by the suggestion that "foure and twenty" may be a scribal error owing to the accidental omission of "v" from "xxviiiij."³ But such an explanation ignores the fact that the age of twenty-nine was not young by medieval standards. One can hardly imagine a man of that age having "but lytel her" on his beard—particularly if one recalls the description of Emetreus in *The Knight's Tale*:

Of fyve and twenty yeer his age I casta.
His berd was wel bigonne for to sprynge. (2172-2173)

If there be any scribal error it is probably owing to the addition rather than the omission of numerals.

It would be as unwise to assert that Chaucer wrote *The Book of the Duchess* without any awareness of the death of Blanche, as to insist that the poem is merely topical. Chaucer did what truly creative artists in all ages have done; he took a profoundly moving human experience and used it as a vehicle for a poem stating in universal terms the meaning of that experience. Furthermore, he added to the pathos of the situation by emphasizing the youthfulness of the Black Knight, for bereavement in youth is even more touching than separation in later life. The source of Chaucer's inspiration was most likely the death of the Duchess of Lancaster, but he was too great a poet to make a merely occasional piece out of the event.

SAMUEL SCHOENBAUM

Brooklyn College

SEWETOURLS CALL THEM BRUSTYLS

The great extent, often not sufficiently appreciated, to which meaning and understanding depend upon familiarity with the context is admirably illustrated by the following paragraph from Professor Holmes' recent book on the Middle Ages.

² Viktor Langhans used the variance in ages to support his view that Chaucer was the Black Knight. See *Untersuchungen zu Chaucer* (Halle, 1918), pp. 280-302. Such an interpretation is hardly tenable.

³ See, for instance, Robinson, p. 884.

Distinction was very clear at this time between the cobbler (*savetier*) and the shoemaker (*cordouanier*). John of Garland refers to the cobblers as being "low" and "vile"; they repaired old shoes. The shoemakers manufactured new footwear, with their "sharp knife, and leather blackened with dye. They sew together their shoes with an awl, a turned up tool, and pigs' bristles [for thread]." ¹

The material in quotation marks represents a translation from Thomas Wright's edition of the Latin of John of Garland; and judging from the practice throughout the book, the words *for thread* have been supplied in an attempt to explain the pigs' bristles.

Since I had spent a few years of my youth working at the gentle craft, it struck me that whoever supplied the explanation—whether John of Garland, Wright, or Professor Holmes—was mistaken about the function of the pigs' bristles. The punctuation likewise might lead to some confusion; *a turned up tool* is not a member of a series, but stands in apposition to *awl*. Shoemakers even today use two kinds of awls: one short and straight, used mostly to make holes for nailing; the other longer and curved, used in sewing two pieces of leather together. In the twelfth century, as it does even today, the bristle functioned as a flexible needle for drawing the wax-end (see NED.) through the holes made with the curved awl.

The wax-end itself is made by twisting several strands of linen into a single thread about a fathom in length and with tapering ends. After it has been coated with shoemakers' wax (a sort of resin or pine-tar), the bristles are attached one at either end by an ingenious operation requiring one to split the bristle part way and then twist it and the thread together so smoothly that the thread will not catch and at the same time so firmly that the bristle will not pull out. In sewing with a wax-end, one first makes a hole with a curved awl through the two pieces to be joined; as he withdraws it he inserts one of the bristles into the hole from the opposite side. Then he inserts the second bristle from the other direction so that he actually draws two strands through the hole, one from each side, in such a way as to "lock" them in.

That they were thus used in the twelfth century is indicated by two of the NED. quotations under the entry BRISTLE.

¹ Holmes, Urban Tigner, Jr., *Daily Living in the Twelfth Century*, University of Wisconsin Press, Madison, 1952, p. 151.

- c. 1380 Wyclif *Serm. Sel. Wks.* II, 148. (The entire sentence, of which NED. quotes only the first few words, runs as follows.) For as bristil bryngiþ in þe breed, and knyttip not þe leþer wiþinne, so Joones penaunce brouzte Crist in, but Joon is not þe grace þat knittip.

1398 Trevisa *Barth. De P. R.* Sewetours call them brustyls and sewe therwyth.

As recently as thirty years ago "hand-turned" shoes and slippers with soles sewed to the uppers by this method were still fairly common. They were made wrong-side out, and then turned after sewing. (The present price of Chinese or Russian bristles, the best and most highly regarded, is sixty dollars a pound, or about two cents per bristle.) With this background information of the process, the sentence in question would probably be most accurately written "They sew together their shoes with an awl (a turned up tool) and pigs' bristles."

HENRY A. PERSON

University of Washington,
Seattle

WYATT, CHAUCER, AND *TERZA RIMA*

Several times in this century Sir Thomas Wyatt has been given credit for introducing *terza rima* into English poetry. As long ago as 1904, W. J. Courthope in his *History of English Poetry* (II, 64), said: "Of the other iambic metres introduced by Wyatt, the most important was the *terza rima*." And as recently as 1929, E. M. W. Tillyard contended: "In the history of English literature Wyatt's satires are important as the first example of *terza rima* in the language."¹ Though Wyatt's proficiency in handling the metre has been questioned, especially by Saintsbury and Tillyard,² no one has made the obvious correction in this matter of metrical pioneering. Yet every Chaucerian knows that "The Complaint to

¹ *The Poetry of Sir Thomas Wyatt* (Scholaris Press), p. 45. The statement is unchanged in the revised edition of 1950. See also Legouis and Cazamian, *History of English Literature*, I, 142. Other commentators which I have read are silent on this matter.

² Saintsbury, for example, calls them "intertwined decasyllables" and "interlaced heroic couplets." In a footnote he admits that "they may be classed as simply *terza rima*, unskilfully written." See *A History of English Prosody* (London, 1906), I, 311.

his Lady," often called a series of metrical experiments, contains a passage in *terza rima*, which F. N. Robinson and J. E. Wells cite as the earliest use in English and the only example before Wyatt.³

It might be argued that the twenty-five lines which appear in the Robinson text illustrate the metre imperfectly and that is right, but W. W. Skeat implicitly blames the MSS, not Chaucer, for this imperfection and easily fills in the blanks with true Chaucerian lines. He even suggests that the passage, now divided into two sections, may once have been continuous.⁴ Actually, of course, Wyatt remains the first to use the form in English for as much as a complete poem, but such statements as those by Courthope and Tillyard clearly need qualification.

MELVIN R. WATSON

Louisiana State University

REVIEWS

Wulfstanstudien. By KARL JOST. Schweizer Anglistische Arbeiten, 23. Band, Bern, 1950. Pp. 271.

Dr. Karl Jost's new book on Wulfstan is a major contribution to our knowledge of that influential and productive archbishop. It was Dr. Jost who initiated the contemporary study of Wulfstan with his article "Einige Wulfstantexte und ihre Quellen" which he published in *Anglia* nearly twenty years ago, and from him was to be expected the careful and accurate investigation this book exhibits. The study is devoted mainly to establishing the canon of Wulfstan's work, and in the process new insights into Wulfstan's habits of thought and into eleventh century legal practices appear.

The conspicuous difference between this work and most previous attempts to fix the canon is that Dr. Jost is very much less mechanical in his study of Wulfstan's style than were his prede-

³ See *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer* (Cambridge, Mass., 1933), p. 971; and *A Manual of the Writings in Middle English* (Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences, 1926), p. 637.

⁴ See *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer* (Oxford, 1894), I, 360-361, 527. Wells accepted the additional lines to make the metre regular. Robinson lists Skeat's emendations in his textual notes, but prints the poem as it is found in the MSS.

cessors. It has taken us a long time to recover from the virtues of the 19th century philologists—their scientific care in collecting data and in analyzing it. But literature can not be assessed entirely by these methods; and in their sturdy attempts to master linguistic difficulties students have sometimes forgotten that even in the prose works of Ælfric and Wulfstan it is after all literature with which we are dealing. Attributing a work to Wulfstan by the number of intensives that form so characteristic a feature of his style is like saying that we can recognize a work of Sir Thomas Browne by the number of Latin words it contains.

Dr. Jost has made profitable observations on the differences between Ælfric's and Wulfstan's vocabularies: Ælfric's use of *æ*, *hælend*, *eadig*, *namian*, for example, where Wulfstan uses *lagu*, *drihten*, *geæslig*, and *hatan*. He has also established certain differentiating features of Wulfstan's syntax, such as his preference for the uninflected form of the infinitive, *þæt we calle ænne God lufian* and *wurðian* instead of *an God is to lufianne* and *to weorðianne*; the appositive position of the adjective in *God ælmihtig* instead of *ælmihlig God*; the absence of the absolute dative; and in general the want of Latinisms in his style. And, throughout, his sense of how a writer works and in particular of how Wulfstan thinks enables him to establish organic criteria in determining the canon. He does not use any dialectal tests and does not refer to the excellent article of the late Robert Menner on this subject,¹ which would have corroborated some of his findings. But his work on the vocabulary is by far the best we have had.

One of the most persistent stumbling blocks to Wulfstan scholarship which is cleared away in this book is the idea of the "Wulfstan imitator." So complicated are the textual relationships between the laws of the early eleventh century, the homilies in Napier's collection, and isolated pieces here and there, and so often do the characteristics of Wulfstan's style appear in contexts obviously not from his pen that scholars, particularly Liebermann, have had recourse to the idea that some imitator of Wulfstan's style was active in the eleventh century and produced the confusing compositions of whose origin we know so little. Jost follows by detailed investigations the increasing scepticism as to the existence of such a ghost writer and concludes that there is no substantial evidence of his existence.

In considering the doubtful homilies Jost distinguishes between compilations which contain parts of Wulfstan's work, which he designates as *sprachlich echt*, and those for whose composition Wulfstan himself was responsible, which he calls *literarisch echt*. Many turn out to be *sprachlich echt und literarisch unecht*. Jost's

¹ "Anglian and Saxon Elements in Wulfstan's Vocabulary," *MLN* LXIII (1948), 1-9.

additions to the canon of homilies not previously accepted are the middle section of XVI which contains the material on Simon Magus, for whose inclusion he thinks Wulfstan responsible, XXV, XXVI, LI, and LIX. LI is not a homily but is a short, highly condensed series of admonitions such as appear in V and VI Æðelred, with a few concrete legal statutes of the moral sort found in those codes. Jost regards it as an outline of what was to be enacted at some meeting of the Witan and thinks Wulfstan must have delivered it in person. He makes a good case for this interpretation, for the sentences which can not be paralleled in Wulfstan's other writings are in his style, and this explanation violates none of the probabilities. If he is right, the document throws valuable light on how the Witan actually made its laws.

Jost enlarges Wulfstan's literary background by the addition of the *Dicta Abbatis Priminii* upon which Wulfstan appears to have drawn for Homilies II and X. This tract of Pirmin's, the eighth century Abbot of Reichenau, has not before been connected with Wulfstan, nor, so far as I know, with any other Old English writer.

Recent interest in Wulfstan has centered in his connection with legislation of the early eleventh century, and Jost recognizes this fact by beginning his book with a study of the laws enacted under Æðelred at Enham, for whose formulation Wulfstan has long been thought responsible. He reaffirms Wulfstan's authorship of V, VI, VIII, IX, and X Æðelred and works out the connection of the Latin redaction of V and VI Æðelred to the English forms of those codes. He finds that this Latin version can not be a mere translation of the English laws because it contains passages in verbal agreement with the Benedictine Rule and with the Pseudo-Egbert Excerptiones. In other parts the Latin seems to render sentences first composed in English, and we have the curious circumstance of this redaction being both source and derivative of V Æðelred. Jost concludes that Wulfstan made first a collection of Latin excerpts that he intended to use in the laws and that when he wrote V Æðelred he drew upon this collection and upon the older English laws. The Latin paraphrase drew independently upon the collection of Latin excerpts and also upon V Æðelred. This is Wulfstan's frequent method when he is working from Latin sources, and Jost proves here, as he has before, that the collector of the excerpts and the author of the text were the same, because the enlarged version makes independent use of material not in the excerpts but derived from the same source. What is equally interesting is Jost's conclusion that the Latin paraphrase is like the Frankish *relatio*, the private report of a participant in a council—here the Witan—written down for his own use and not as a public document.

He carries the argument still farther and says that VI Æðelred

is likewise a *Privatarbeit* enlarged from V Æðelred and the Latin paraphrase, and that it represents not what the Witan actually did legislate but what it ought to have enacted. This opinion he bases upon the fact that VI differs from V Æðelred in being more ecclesiastical in tone, translating the admonition of the Latin into legal form and making the prohibitions against fornication and adultery much more detailed. The further point that the softening of punishments, one of Wulfstan's great concerns, is carried farther in VI Æðelred than in V encourages Jost to suppose that in the actions of the Witan at Enham Wulfstan met some opposition to his ideas and that VI Æðelred comes nearer to expressing his own wishes than the actual legislation incorporated into V Æðelred.

This is an ingenious explanation for the very puzzling relationship between the two codes, for which there has been thus far no plausible guess. But Wulfstan was above all things a public figure, and we need to know for what reason he would draw up a private document of this character. If Jost agreed with Miss Whitelock² that the laws of Cnut were shaped by Wulfstan we could see at least to what use such a work had later been put, for Cnut's laws use this version extensively. But he does not accept her explanation of the version of Cnut's laws in MS C.C.C.C. 201 which she thinks the first form of the codes, preferring to regard it as a rather poor compilation of passages from V and VI Æðelred and I and II Cnut; and because of scribal errors he rejects the preamble which states that the ordinance was drawn up as soon as Cnut became king. But it seems to me that Jost tends to treat this version as if it were a finished work (pp. 96, 99), whereas Miss Whitelock's point is that it is an introductory outline. And though the scribe of this manuscript was notoriously careless about orthography, we have no good reason to reject his preface to the Pastoral Letter, which Jost accepts, nor, it seems to me, to this code. Might the D version of these laws have been just such a document as Jost thinks Homily LI was?

In connection with the laws Dr. Jost has made a careful study of Homily L, which is made up almost entirely of excerpts from the later laws of Æðelred, Polity, Ælfric's Pastoral Letters, and Wulfstan's homilies, and proposes the theory that it was a sermon delivered to the assembled counsellors at the coronation of Edward the Confessor (p. 260).

As to the Institutes of Polity, long the object of Dr. Jost's studies, he distinguishes between two versions, as Thorpe's edition does not permit us to do, Polity I contained in MSS C.C.C.C. 201 and Nero A 1, and Polity II in MS Junius 121, and thinks Wulfstan the author of I but not of II. Here as elsewhere he has helped to free us from the mighty weight of Liebermann's opinions.

² "Wulfstan and the Laws of Cnut," *EHR* LXIII (1948), 433-52.

There is a short section on "Wulfstan als Theologe" (pp. 168-72) in which the author makes an excellent point of Wulfstan's legal—almost legalistic—turn of mind. Whereas for Ælfric the opposite poles of thought are "good" and "evil," "die eigentlichen Kernpunkte von Wulfstans religiösem Denken sind die Begriffe 'recht' und 'unrecht'" (p. 169). What is right is God's will as expressed in his commandments and his teaching, and Wulfstan's concern for the plain law of God as opposed to theological subtleties, is written on every page of his work.

The study of late Old English literature is made extraordinarily difficult by the existence of many dependent texts, among which priority is hard to ascertain, and a very large number of these are connected in some way with Wulfstan. Dr. Jost's unflinching study has solved many of these puzzles, and not only students of Wulfstan but mediaevalists everywhere will be grateful to him.

DOROTHY BETHURUM

Connecticut College

George Chapman (1559-1634): sa vie, sa poésie, son théâtre, sa pensée. By JEAN JACQUOT. Annales de l'Université de Lyon, Troisième Série, Lettres, Fascicule 19. Paris: *Les Belles Lettres*, 1951. Pp. 308.

This is the first full-length book ever to attempt a full-length picture of George Chapman. As such, it fills the place of the work which, over a quarter of a century ago, M. Emile Legouis hoped that M. Franck L. Schoell would some time write. French scholarship has served Chapman well. In 1926 M. Schoell, with his *Etudes sur l'Humanisme Continental en Angleterre*, laid the groundwork for all future investigation into Chapman's sources and thought. M. Emile Legouis introduced this book to the public, and his interest in Chapman was evidently inherited by his son, for M. Pierre Legouis directed M. Jacquot's work. Written in fulfilment of the requirements for a "doctorat ès Lettres," Jacquot's *Chapman* is the product of careful scholarship and mature thought.

The book is divided in three parts: the first treating Chapman's life, the second his poems and plays, and the third his thought. One notices the omission of a part devoted to his translations, but M. Jacquot is concerned with Chapman's original work and feels that, since the translations have been the subject of a number of special studies, he can confine his attention to the light that they throw on Chapman's ideas and art. Jacquot is himself a generous translator. For his French public he provides line-by-line translations of the verse passages that he cites, and for ampler elucidation of

the points made about the quality of Chapman's plays, he includes several long excerpts. His summaries of the contents of Chapman's most important poems and all his plays are models of clarity, and will serve as a useful review for those who have read Chapman as well as an introduction to newcomers. The bibliography is carefully selected and the index of proper names meticulous; it might be urged that in a new printing there be added a subject index. This is a long book and its practical value would be enhanced if it furnished ready reference to its recurrent themes.

Information about Chapman's life has always been sketchy. His biography is largely derived from speculations about his relationships with contemporaries whose activities are better documented than his own. Mr. Mark Eccles, however, has recently given us a few facts to go on for Chapman's early years, and M. Jacquot uses these to good advantage. We now know, for example, that Chapman did spend a period of time on the continent, although proof is still lacking that he fought in the War of the Netherlands. Jacquot is strongly inclined to follow the tradition that he did, for he notes Chapman's great admiration for martial heroes as evidenced both in his affinity for the *Iliad* and his character portrayals in the tragedies: "Il considère d'ailleurs la discipline militaire, avec le stoïcisme qu'elle exige, comme une excellente préparation à la vie spirituelle telle qu'il l'entend." The character of Chapman that emerges from Jacquot's chronological survey of his writing and his known associations is well drawn. His proud nature, his impulsiveness, his passion for nobility of thought have all been described before, and Jacquot does not differ essentially from the derivative impression that most of us retain. But there is an arresting new phrase: Jacquot sees Chapman as an "ancien soldat" whose admiration for brave action was as strong as his religious and mystical tendency.

In the realm of discovery, Jacquot has added several new sources to the continent of learning explored by M. Schoell. A passage from Dante's *Inferno* is clearly shown to be the source of Chapman's image of Dissimulation in the fourth Sestiad of *Hero and Leander*. The central idea of the allegorical *Teares of Peace* is traced to the *Querela Pacis* of Erasmus and the preface which Thomas Paynell affixed to his translation of that work, *The Complaint of Peace* (1559). But, most profitably, following the clue of Miss Janet Spens' perceptive comment that Chapman's vision of Homer is comparable to the vision that opens the *Corpus Hermeticum*, Jacquot establishes Chapman's acquaintance with hermetic writings.

Chapman possessed a copy of Iamblichus' *De Mysteriis Aegyptiorum* as translated by Ficino, the scholar to whom he was so indebted for his knowledge of Plato. In this book he would have found the concept of the familiar spirit, the individual demon who guides the soul until such time as it may reach the point of perfec-

tion at which a god will assume its charge. Chapman was pleased to think that the spirit of Homer had assumed like guidance over him and that by doing Homer's bidding he was advancing to perfection, to God. Thus Chapman followed a train of thought that led from hermetic doctrines to Platonic ideals to a Christian maker. Jacquot points out that, although the hermetic books date only from the third century AD, Ficino thought of Hermes the Egyptian as the father of theology and the forerunner of Pythagoras and Plato. It is in *The Teares of Peace* that Jacquot has found the clearest traces of hermetic thought, and these derive from the book *Poimandres*, which was readily accessible to Chapman in the collection of Iamblichus. Jacquot's synopsis of the argument in *Poimandres* that explains how a human being may attain to gnosis throws much needed light on Chapman's use of such terms as Intelligence, Soul, Spirit, and Mind; while further explorations in Ficino's translation of the *Hermetica* gloss his esoteric allusions to Eternity, the World, Time, Generation, Perseverance, and Restoration. In this work, too, lies the occult significance of the Spirits in *Bussy d'Ambois*.

Through such revelations M. Jacquot adds immeasurably to our knowledge of Chapman's imaginative acceptance of neo-Platonism. As Jacquot says, the conflict between sane and morbid instincts is conspicuous in Chapman's poetic and dramatic work, and the same dichotomy is found in the *Hermetica* where the world is sometimes regarded as a splendid creation, sometimes as the domain of evil. On the whole, for reasons of temperament and courtly misfortunes, the aspect of evil had the stronger hold on Chapman, and thus it might be said that moral necessity attracted him to the stoical thinking that has been so much more frequently studied and acknowledged in his work than the Platonic. But if stoicism served as a moral crutch, Platonism was the light in his religious cosmos. Jacquot is convinced that the true philosopher and Christian poet, acclaimed by the epitaph on Chapman's tombstone, was "avant tout un poète platonicien." This is a new thesis, ably sustained.

PHYLLIS BARTLETT

Queens College

The Good Wife Taught her Daughter, The Good Wyfe Wold a Pylgremage, and The Thewis of Gud Women. Edited by TAUNO F. MUSTANOJA. (*Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae*, B LXI, 2). Helsinki, 1948. Pp. 259.

Here printed together for the first time are the three Middle English exhortative pieces, the so-called "Good Wife" poems, in

which a mother counsels and admonishes her daughter. These poems are a part of the tradition of parental instructions so wide-spread in the Middle Ages, and are filled with gnomic elements and homely wisdom almost as old as language itself. In *The Good Wife Taught her Daughter*, for example, we find a warning against attending wrestling matches, succumbing to the smooth-talking male, and getting drunk too often (!). The young girl is taught how to converse, how to carry herself ("Braundiz noȝt þin heued, þine schuldres þou ne caste"), and how to treat her husband. In a few cases the advice of the mother for her daughter seems, to this reviewer at least, to have intrinsic value for the modern reader; there is an occasional bit of wisdom, lost in the course of generations, of which we need to be reminded. For instance, after instructing the girl in the ways of marriage and running a household, the mother offers her some advice on raising children:

geþ þou louie þine children wel, hold hem fol lowe.
 geþ ony of hem misdo, ne banne þou noȝt, ne blowe,
 Bote tak a smert ȝerde and bet hem arowe,
 Til þei crien mercy and beo here gelte aknowe.

Mr. Mustanoja has included in his edition a thorough survey of medieval English and French parental instructions, as well as the complete text of each of the known manuscripts of the three poems—six versions of *The Good Wife Taught her Daughter*, one of *The Good Wyfe Wold a Pilgremage*, and two of *The Thewis of Gud Women*. The MSS are carefully described, and the date, provenance, and dialect of each are given careful consideration. Perhaps a word of caution would be in order concerning this latter section of the Introduction. In his discussion of the language of the MSS the editor does not always recognize adequately the complexity of the dialect evidence. For instance, MS H of *The Good Wife Taught her Daughter* he classifies South-East Midland, without attempting to discuss other evidence, such as the presence of pres. ind. 2nd sg. ending -es found in the rhyme *standes . . . handes* (135-6), and such significant spellings as *awheynte* for *aqueynte* (70), and *whemyth* for *quemyth* (131).

Since the editor has the advantage of having sighted the MSS, he must in general be relied on to provide us with their dates. I feel compelled to suggest, however, that his estimate of the date 1350 for the Emmanuel College MS (E) seems somewhat early. It may be that the presence of conservative Southern or South-Western dialect forms influenced his judgment. But we have here a crucial point, since the date of this MS (which is in all probability the earliest) is practically the only evidence available for dating *The Good Wife Taught her Daughter*. In the absence of a clear *terminus ad quem* for MS E, it would no doubt be safer, if less satisfying, to assign it simply to the latter half of the fourteenth century.

In his attempt to determine the relationships of the MSS of *The Good Wife Taught her Daughter* the editor is handicapped by the brevity of the poem, which has little more than 200 lines in the fullest versions. There are difficulties, however, in his classification which cannot be overlooked because of lack of evidence. His study of the variant readings of the six MSS (E, H, L, N, and A) reveals a close relationship between L and T, some signs of relationship between LT and N, and "a few vague indications" of a connection between H and N. He then classifies the MSS in two main groups: ELTN (with N as one branch of the subgroup LTN) and HA. He offers no evidence for the group ELTN or HA as a whole. My own examination of the text reveals a somewhat different classification. A close relationship between E and H is indicated by readings which these two MSS share, as against LTNA, in lines E 8, 13, 73, 115, 116, 120, 121, and 147. There is no evidence of any connection between H and A. On the other hand, A omits lines in common with L or N or both in stanzas 14, 18, 21, and 35. Further, the extensive alterations of lines in A may very well have obscured its relationship with LTN. For example, the text of A is so thoroughly altered in four of the eight LTN readings that there is no way of determining what must have been the reading of its unrevised ancestor. In view of all this, it seems more likely that the classification should be: a group EH and a group LTNA, with LT a subgroup of the latter.

In spite of these short-comings the edition as a whole is well executed. In a field where a few scholars have in the past been tempted to withhold MS readings in defense of preconceived theories, it is gratifying to find such a full presentation of the evidence, enabling the student to check his own findings against those of the editor.

D. C. FOWLER

University of Washington,
Seattle, Wash.

Molière et Le Misanthrope. Par RENÉ JASINSKI. Paris: Armand Colin, 1951. Pp. 327.

In this extensive and detailed study of Molière's masterpiece M. Jasinski investigates the sources of the play in literature and in Molière's life, devotes over a hundred pages to the characters, then studies the lesson and the art of the comedy. He goes extensively into the literature of the times, into such works as Bary's *Défense de la jalousie* and the *Grand Cyrus* to show that the questions discussed in *le Misanthrope* were in the air, and he points out, at greater length than Mr. Sells, the similarity of thought between

Molière and his friend La Mothe le Vayer. The conclusions reached will carry conviction to many and show the author as an enthusiastic admirer of Molière and one who has a good command of what has been written about him.

I must protest, however, against the use he makes of Grimarest and *la Fameuse Comédienne*. Jasinski admits that they are unreliable, yet he bases chiefly on their gossip the notions that Molière had been the lover of Madeleine Béjart, then of Catherine de Brie, and that he had tried in vain to make la Du Parc his mistress. He is quite sure that his wife was unfaithful to him. Like Michaut, I refuse to defend the reputation of any of these ladies, but I would not accept against them the statements of the two works mentioned, or conclude that Armande, la de Brie, and la Du Parc were, respectively, the models for Célimène, Eliante, and Arsinoé. If Molière had had as guides only these actresses, traveling about France not long before as strolling players, how could he have given an air of aristocratic elegance to Célimène and her salon?

Nor can I see Molière himself in *Alceste* (p. 112), even if he is at the same time *Philinte* (p. 119), an extraordinary combination! And I do not feel that the latter "s'élève à la plus haute humanité" (p. 189), even if he would have been more capable than *Alceste* of managing a troupe.

Jasinski admits that *le Misanthrope* is not a "pièce à thèse," yet he keeps talking about Molière's preaching. One can, of course, draw a lesson from any great work of art, but the question is whether an author is primarily interested in preaching, whether he adapts his work to that endeavor at the expense of his art. This, it seems to me, Molière very rarely did, certainly not in *le Misanthrope*, so that, in the interest of his art, I object to the emphasis here placed on his "leçon."

There are a few other comments I would make:

P. 31, the *Bradamante* of Saint-Aignan is described as "fort médiocre"; as it is lost and no account of it has survived, how is this judgment arrived at? P. 33, note, the quotation made by M. Adam is from a document of August, 1665, which states that, when first acted, *Tartuffe* was only half written; but this does not prove that it did not then have an ending, for the writer may well have known that, by November, 1664, the play had five acts, so that he could have expressed himself as he did if the play, when first acted, had an ending that was subsequently altered to allow the addition of two acts. P. 42, the first comédie-ballet was not *le Mariage forcé*, but *les Fâcheux*. P. 46, "Excédé, épuisé, il [Molière] tombe enfin malade, au point qu'il doit fermer son théâtre du 29 décembre au 21 février." Pathetic, but, according to La Grange, the theater was closed at that time on account of the queen mother's last illness and death. Molière, who almost died on the stage in 1673, would not have closed his theater for any length of time on account of his own illness. P. 189, *Le Philinte de Molière* was not by Collin d'Harleville, but by Fabre d'Eglantine. P. 225, Eliante "est cultivée . . . sa libre adaptation de Lucrèce . . . atteste sa pratique des textes philosophiques et moraux." But Lucretius is not mentioned in

the play; it was Molière who imitated him, not Eliante. One might as well affirm that Harpagon and Sosie had read Plautus! P. 310, "rire dans l'âme" is not Molière's phrase, but was said of *le Misanthrope* by de Visé. Pp. 195, 320, 241: "le sonnet d'Orante ne manque pas de grâce"; it is "charmant à tant d'égards"; the "couplet d'Alceste peut charmer aujourd'hui les amateurs de folklore. Il ne pouvait que faire sourire en son temps les auditeurs lettrés." I should like to have some proof that these statements indicate, not merely personal taste, but the attitude of Molière's seventeenth-century audiences.

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

Daily Living in the Twelfth Century. Based on the Observations of Alexander Neckam in London and Paris. By URBAN TIGNER HOLMES, JR. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1952. Pp. ix + 337. \$3.85.

This book is intended to help students of mediaeval literature understand the general background of their subject. Using the journey of Alexander Neckam from Dunstable to Paris as a loose framework, it manages to incorporate an immense amount of miscellaneous information about what such a traveller might be expected to have seen and done. Primary sources in Latin and the vernacular dating for the most part between 1150 and 1200—among them Neckam's own *De nominibus utensilium* and *De naturis rerum*—have been extensively drawn upon, as well as some archaeological and iconographical evidence of the period. The titles of the chapters (London, The Journey to Paris, Lodgings in the City, Gown, Town, The Baron and his Castle, Manor House and Peasant) give only the merest hint of the wealth of material included, whereas the final chapter alone, accurately entitled "To Talk of Many Things," in which the framework is frankly deserted, deals with such diverse subjects as ideals of personal beauty, causes of death, diet, instruction, animals, hunting, letters, music, aesthetics, superstitions, astrology, the minor arts, sculpture, painting, architecture, law, justice, taxation, money and heretical sects.

Some of these topics, as well as many others, also appear in earlier chapters where the places that Neckam might have visited and the contacts he might have made with travellers, students, teachers, craftsmen and a wide variety of persons of all classes suggest numerous themes for treatment. Sometimes the association is tenuous and Neckam is abandoned; often one wonders why a given item occurs where it does rather than elsewhere in the volume. Indeed the capricious arrangement of the book detracts somewhat from its usefulness since the fictional approach tends to pigeonhole the factual content rather arbitrarily. Nevertheless the picturesque

plan adopted by the author has its own advantages and a fairly full index helps in locating particular topics. The author displays imagination and wide learning in his selection of material, and many a detail will cause the reader to chuckle. For example, Alexander, like the modern car-owner, found that "one could take his own palfrey or mule across the Channel, but it would be more advantageous to buy a mount at the port in Picardy and sell it in Paris" (p. 40).

Naturally, in a book almost encyclopaedic in its coverage, specialists may have reservations and offer corrections. Nor can it be expected to be profound in treating within such small compass so many arts and trades, customs and manners, so many topographic, economic and social particulars. Unfortunately control of the evidence has been made needlessly difficult by the absence of a bibliography citing the copious abbreviations used: these are hidden among the footnotes arranged by chapters at the end of the book, and one is obliged to search through many pages for the explanation of E. B., N. R., F. S., W. M. and the rest.

However, Mr. Holmes fulfills the purpose of supplying students of mediaeval literature with "a personal interpretation based upon primary texts" (p. viii) and contributes charming vignettes and helpful suggestions along the way. A few well-chosen illustrations, sketches and charts, as well as maps of London and Paris in the year 1180, help to enliven the volume. Explicitly and implicitly the equation between literature and daily living emerges, and the reader is so grateful for the profusion of good things offered that he is disinclined to mention his own small reservations. Obviously the book contains the gleanings of many diversified harvests and has been written *con amore*.

GRACE FRANK

Baltimore

Sturge Moore and the Life of Art. By FREDERICK L. GWYNN.
Lawrence, University of Kansas Press, 1951. Pp. 159. \$3.00.

Though ignored so completely since his death in 1944 that his work remains all but unknown to many students of contemporary literature, T. Sturge Moore undoubtedly had a real if consciously esoteric talent, a depth of insight and a seriousness of purpose which once commanded the respect of a small discerning public. In *Sturge Moore and the Life of Art*, the first full-length appraisal of the man and his thought, Frederick L. Gwynn defends the artist as "an important poet and a unique figure in modern culture," one who "promulgated the virtues and vices of Hellenism and Hebraism by an original poetic myth," and who "more than any poet writing in English in his time—except Yeats— . . . devoted himself to the life of art and of the spirit."

Leaving a close consideration of the poetic technique for some later study, Mr. Gwynn concentrates on Sturge Moore's career and his "ethico-esthetic" mythology in order to establish his "special majority" as poet. Yet he confesses to finding so many defects of form and infelicities of style that it is difficult to see how the poet's final achievement could ever be commensurate with his high intention. And the reader who turns from the criticism to the poems may well feel that much of Sturge Moore's uniqueness lies in the rarefied atmosphere of the verse itself, in its peculiar isolation not only from the main currents of modern poetry but also from the vital experience of less intensely dedicated men.

In the biographical first two-thirds of his book Mr. Gwynn succeeds in tracing year by year Sturge Moore's continuing self-education, his persistent interest in the arts, graphic and dramatic as well as poetic, and his friendships with Charles Shannon, Charles Ricketts, "Michael Field," Yeats, and others who came to admire his seriously dedicated sensibility. But insofar as there were few intellectual or emotional crises in this life of art, Mr. Gwynn seems to have some difficulty in making vivid his conscientious chronicle of the artist's development. His writing, at any rate, gains a good deal in warmth, readability, and precision of analysis as he moves into the last of the biographical chapters, an excellent "Character of Sturge Moore," frankly sympathetic yet judiciously balanced.

Apart from this "character," most readers are likely to find the greatest value of the monograph in the last third, which presents a clear criticism of the poet's aesthetic and an able elucidation of his moral mythology. Mr. Gwynn says nothing of a possible parallel to the art theories of Roger Fry, who was apparently one of the poet's close friends and surely one of the most competent of contemporary art-critics. But he explores with some care the avowed debt to Flaubert and Matthew Arnold, who remained until the last "Sturge Moore's literary and spiritual gods"; and in so doing, he reveals a wide-ranging knowledge of the nineteenth-century traditions which the poet shaped to his own purposes. Likewise adroit is the final analysis of the symbolism of "Nemesis and Ge," an understanding of which is a prerequisite to a reading of almost all the longer poems. Mr. Gwynn has appended to his text a thorough bibliography and an unusually complete index; and, though he furnishes us no examples of Sturge Moore's fine woodcuts, he has included several first-rate photographs.

JEROME HAMILTON BUCKLEY

University of Wisconsin

Speranza: a Biography of Lady Wilde. By HORACE WYNDHAM.
New York, Philosophical Library, 1951. Pp. 247. \$4.50.

Amid the self-recriminations of his *De Profundis*, Oscar Wilde boasted that his parents had bequeathed him "a name they had made noble and honoured, not merely in literature, art, archaeology, and science, but in the public history of my own country, in its evolution as a nation." Several years ago T. G. Wilson in *Victorian Doctor* gave us a more disinterested estimate of the father, certainly a man of many skills, yet hardly a model of personal integrity, honor, or nobility. Now in *Speranza* Horace Wyndham, with his customary journalistic gusto, tells us perhaps all we need to know of the public life of the mother, a flamboyant though not untalented eccentric who fancied herself "the Madame Récamier of Dublin and London."

The new biography includes a useful if rather uncritical account of Lady Wilde's role in the Irish nationalist movement, quotes a number of the highly rhetorical verses she contributed under the pseudonym "Speranza," and even reproduces in an appendix the notorious political pamphlet "Jacta Alea Est" and an incendiary essay, now "excessively rare," entitled "The American Irish." But the Dublin setting in which she shone with self-conscious radiance is at best poorly realized; and the Irish part of the chronicle is in general far less vivid than the disproportionately long record of Speranza's last years in London. Here she conducted a succession of seedy salons to which she attracted old lions as prominent as Browning and young ones as promising as Yeats. Mr. Wyndham's sub-acid description of these afternoons "at home" should be of some value in rounding out our impression of the "aesthetic" 'eighties, the milieu in which Bernard Shaw and others whom she befriended began their literary careers. But nowhere in his study does the biographer probe at all deeply the actual character of his subject. He makes no mention, for example, of Lady Wilde's private reaction to the trial of the tragic comedian who was her son, an event which, as Oscar himself suggested, must have been to her a source of endless pain. Consequently the book as a whole lacks the depth and complexity of portrayal which Michael Sadleir, working with not dissimilar materials, achieved in *The Strange Life of Lady Blessington*. And this deficiency seems all the more conspicuous insofar as even the literary gossip, entertaining enough in itself, suffers the defects of loose organization and careless editing.

JEROME HAMILTON BUCKLEY

University of Wisconsin

Whitman and Rolleston, A Correspondence. Edited by HORST FRENZ. Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University, 1951. Pp. 137. \$1.50.

Thomas W. Rolleston, the Irish scholar and critic, belonged to the Trinity College group which sought to bring Whitman to the attention of readers abroad. He collaborated with Karl Knortz on the first major German translation of *Leaves of Grass*, and his enthusiasm inspired J. Fitzgerald Lee to start work on a Russian version. Rolleston's correspondence with Whitman, as would be anticipated, is primarily concerned with the exchange of articles and books, arrangements for translations, and minor questions of criticism. Occasionally, he comments briefly on the current political and literary events in Ireland or describes his travel on the continent. Whitman's replies are short, cordial notes important only as records of the poet's activities in his declining years.

This volume contains the available letters and postcards of their correspondence—thirty-one in all, seven of which Whitman sent to Rolleston. A letter from Lee to Whitman about the Russian translation is also included. Some of these items have appeared in print before, but Mr. Frenz presents them all chronologically and annotated. The appendices contain two of Rolleston's articles—an obituary of Whitman and excerpts from a lecture delivered in Dresden on the poet's relationship to German philosophy. These reveal an impressive literary background, but little critical ability.

In the introduction Professor Frenz summarizes the Whitman-Rolleston friendship as well as the history of the Rolleston-Knortz translation. His wide acquaintanceship with the German reception of *Leaves of Grass* is apparent in his notes throughout the book, but the Whitman student might have been better served if the precise location of each manuscript had been stated, and if other annotations had been more complete. Whitman's stricture about American writers as expressing nothing characteristic and sufficing only "the lowest level of vacant minds" which Rolleston quotes in reference to Emerson does appear in *Democratic Vistas* although Professor Frenz believes that it "is doubtful that Whitman has made such a statement." More important, when *Kottabos*, the Trinity College magazine, is said to contain "Euthanasia," a poem by Whitman himself, the reader should not be left mystified, but should be given full information about this unfamiliar poem.

The amount of information relating to Whitman is so vast and ubiquitous that studies like this one are necessary for purposes of correlation and investigation. The Whitman specialist will be glad to have this volume, but others will find it of little value since it neither revises our knowledge nor uncovers important new facts.

ROLLO G. SILVER

School of Library Science, Simmons College

Robert Burns. By DAVID DAICHES. New York: Rinehart, 1950.
Pp. vii + 376.

Here is an excellent book: sound in its scholarship, informative, readable. In the judgment of this reviewer it is the best commentary on Burns's poetry that has yet appeared. In the Preface Mr. Daiches states his purpose thus: "I have tried to see Burns and his poetry in a wider context than that provided by traditional Burns studies; . . . to throw as much light as I can on Burns the poet, with a view to increasing understanding and appreciation of his poetry" (p. v). In this attempt Mr. Daiches has been highly successful. And though the main thrust of the book is criticism and not biography, the important facts of Burns's life emerge clearly from pages devoted chiefly to other matters.

Three of the seven chapters merit special commendation. The first, "The Scottish Literary Tradition," is more than its title suggests. It is a skillful synthesis of Scottish history from the fifteenth century to the middle of the eighteenth, plus pertinent comments on the Scots who were writing during those years—all by way of backdrops against which Burns's own accomplishment is to be presented. Chapters three and four, "The Kilmarnock Volume" and "The Omitted Poems," form a single highly readable unit. There is little here about the songs, most of which were written later in Burns's life, and are adequately commented on in Chapter seven. "Tam," too, is still in the future. But "The Twa Dogs," "Address to the Deil," "Holy Fair," "Cotter's Saturday Night," "To a Mouse," "Address to the Unco Guid," "Holy Willie's Prayer," "Jolly Beggars," and the best of the "Epistles" are here analyzed objectively but appreciatively. It is this handful of poems, plus the songs, which have given Burns his position of unique distinction in world literature. In no other place has so much intelligent and thought-producing good sense been written about Burns's greatest poems as in the 128 pages of these two chapters.

Mr. Daiches's enviable acquaintance with Scottish literature, folk-song, and music, has stood him in good stead. Occasionally he is inclined to overstate a case, and to see great merit where little resides. One wishes he had given more space to Burns's notable skill in purely English diction, and to his superlative powers as a metrist. But it would be ungenerous to close this brief review on a note of faultfinding. The shortcomings of the book are few; its virtues are many. Whoever is interested in Scottish literature will learn much from its pages.

FRANKLYN B. SNYDER

Northwestern University

Despair and Hope. A Study in Langland and Augustine. By SISTER ROSE BERNARD DONNA. Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press. 1948. Pp. 192.

Its title makes it evident that this book will appeal more strongly to those interested in the theological background of *Piers Plowman* than to those primarily concerned with the poem as literature. Assuming, quite properly, that Langland's definition of hope and despair (wanhope) is similar to Augustine's, Sister Rose Bernard points out the importance of these concepts to an understanding of the poem. Her method is to illustrate by quotation from Augustine Langland's discussions of the pair of opposites, and she thus provides a running commentary on those parts of the poem in which hope and despair are concerned. About despair, unfortunately, Langland has little to say, so that in her treatment of it Sister Rose Bernard is forced to operate from a sort of elongated inference: since wanhope is the natural consequence of yielding to the seven deadly sins, it follows, apparently, that when Langland is talking about these sins he is also talking about wanhope. But this is to confuse the identities of various links in a chain merely because they have a similar function. Hope receives a larger measure of direct treatment in *Piers Plowman*, and Sister Rose Bernard's discussion of it is more rewarding, though even here she seems at times to let the hopefulness that Christianity offers mankind serve in the absence of any explicit hope mentioned by the poet. The limitations of the subject naturally prevent her from venturing into the thornier portions of the poem, so that the author must content herself with throwing light on relatively small areas. This her commentary does with some effectiveness. The manner of the commentary itself is perhaps too often homiletic rather than hermeneutic, and Sister Rose Bernard's practice of overstating the obvious weakens her book. Thus the observation that Langland and Augustine "agree that it is difficult to be a good Christian in the face of the constant activity of the seven deadly sins; both show that sin leads to despair," does not do justice to her occasional perceptiveness.

Of general interest is the attempt to show that, since *Piers Plowman* carries a message of theological hope, it does not end in despair, as it so often has been said to do. But one wonders whether this is not just a quibble. It is not of his own salvation that the poet seems to despair, but of the salvation of the folk on the field; hence theological despair, which, according to the authorities Sister Rose Bernard cites, has to do only with the individual soul in its relation to God, does not really figure in the end of the poem. In any case, an orthodox Christian poet who understands fully the sinfulness of despair may nevertheless despair poetically, particularly when he has, like Langland, great tenderness for an erring

humanity that will not seek its own salvation. Theological despair is paralyzing to the spirit, but poetic despair may be galvanizing, and Langland was a poet. Such studies as Sister Rose Bernard's of the theological context of *Piers Plowman* are extremely valuable—indeed indispensable—to a correct evaluation of the poem, but I do not think that theology may be invoked to unsay poetry. One may agree that the poet did not himself despair, but *despair* is nevertheless no very inaccurate term for the mood of the poem's conclusion.

E. TALBOT DONALDSON

Yale University

The Bibliographical History of Anonyma and Pseudonyma. By ARCHER TAYLOR and FREDERIC J. MOSHER. Chicago: University of Chicago Press for the Newberry Library, 1951. Pp. x + 289. \$12.50.

As the title suggests, this is a very learned book, containing a vast collection of facts about works concerned with the identification of writers. The authors point out that homonyms alone seem to have interested the ancients and that to the problems that these created were added those produced during the Renaissance by Latinized and Hellenized names. Some authors altered their names but slightly, as did Zepernik when he became Copernicus; others translated their names, as when Holtzmann called himself Xylander; while others concealed completely their identity, as did Müller in taking the name of Regiomontanus (p. 31). A chapter is devoted to pseudepigrapha, where authorship is altered in an effort to gain authority, a subject that interested humanists and protestant reformers from the time that Lorenzo Valla showed that Constantine's Donation was a spurious document (p. 32). Similar investigation into the canon of the Bible led protestants to classify as the Apocrypha books accepted as authoritative by the Council of Trent.

The fourth and principal chapter is concerned with anonyma and pseudonyma. The first treatise on the subject known to the authors was written by a Lutheran bishop of Pomerania, Johann Wigand, in the sixteenth century (p. 89); the first clearly bibliographical treatment, by P. L. Scaven, a Dane, in 1665 (p. 101). Nine years later appeared the important *Syntagma* of Vincent Placcius, "the first omnibus volume in the field of bibliography" (p. 106). It was followed by the same author's *Theatrum* (1708) and by the well-known French contributions of Baillet, Barbier, and Quérard. A great many authors of more specialized bibliographers are also examined. A fifth chapter is devoted to confusing titles, to fictitious

publishers, and to fictitious places and dates of publication. Then come seventy-three pages of bibliography, a guide to "Dictionaries and other lists of anonyms and pseudonyms," and an index.

To the publishers let me say that, as this book deserves wide diffusion among librarians and other scholars, it is unfortunate that so high a price as \$12.50 should be placed upon it. To the authors I have few suggestions to make¹ and would express only my admiration for their erudition and for their industry.

H. C. LANCASTER

BRIEF MENTION

Historical Outlines of English Sounds and Inflections. By SAMUEL MOORE. Revised by ALBERT H. MARCKWARDT. Ann Arbor (Mich.): George Wahr, 1951. Pp. viii, 179. \$3.90. This textbook for graduate students first came out in 1919. The present revision has been made in a pious spirit: "a thoroughgoing alteration of the scheme of organization, some changes in presentation, but, except in one instance, no essential difference in the factual content or the conclusions which have been derived from these facts" (p. v). "The greatest difference between this and the preceding editions will be found in the treatment of Middle English dialects" (p. vi). But even this change is based on the work of Moore and his colleagues of the Middle English Dictionary and reflects Moore's latest views. Mr. Marckwardt's remodeling of the book has made it a better tool and in its new form it ought to meet the needs of students for years to come. It is not free from misprints and other small slips, but these can readily be caught by the student himself or at any rate by his teacher. An example is the mistake that somehow got into the first column of phonetic symbols on p. 10. In a few matters I find myself in disagreement with the learned author and his reviser, but I need not take up such questions here.

K. M.

¹ On p. 25 for Defroches read Desroches. On p. 86 Grotius and Molière are mentioned together, though their cases are quite different, for, while Grotius "hid under the name 'Sibrandus Lubertus,'" Poquelin took the name Molière as an actor in accordance with stage convention long before he used it as an author; and when his name first appears on published plays (1660-62), the initials of his real name are retained along with his stage name (J. B. P. Molière); he did not substitute, as Grotius had done, the assumed name for the real one. Pp. 195-6, the reader might well be warned against accepting the identifications suggested by Paul Lacroix.

The Theater of Louis-Benoît Picard. By WALTER STAAKS. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1952. Pp. viii + 104. (University of California Publications in Modern Philology, XXVIII, No. 7, pp. 359-462.) This is a University of Illinois dissertation, reduced in size by the omission of biographical data, plot summaries, corroborative quotations, etc. What remains is an impartial study of Picard, the leading French comic dramatist between Beaumarchais and Scribe. Dr. Staaks prefers among his many plays *Médiocre et rampant*, *le Collatéral*, *la Petite Ville*, *Duhautcours*, written in collaboration with Chéron, and *les Marionnettes*. He finds that the author's talent diminished during the Restoration. If he had had more space at his disposal, he might have gone more thoroughly into certain aspects of Picard's work, such as its relations with earlier plays and its presentation on the stage. With the exception of Picard himself, actors are rarely mentioned. It is not always clear in what theater a comedy was acted. However, the monograph is a useful guide for those who wish to read only a few of Picard's eighty-three plays.

H. C. L.

Shakespeare Survey 4. Edited by ALLARDYCE NICOLL. Cambridge: CUP, 1951. Pp. ix + 176. Fourteen plates, \$2.75. The fourth volume of this work continues on the same level as the previous three. The original articles incline to be commonplace or trivial, but there is little left to say about Shakespeare that does not fall into one of these two classifications. The surveys of scholarship and the reports on productions are as usual informative and valuable. Gielgud's paper on "Tradition, style and the theatre to-day" is one of the high spots in the book and should be of permanent interest. The book is, of course, handsomely produced.

D. C. A.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

Boas, F. S., and White, Beatrice (eds.).—The Year's Work in English Studies. Vol. 31 for 1950. London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1952. Pp. 288. \$3.00.

Cynwulf.—Sant' Elewa. Ed. by Sergio Lupi. Naples: Libreria Scientifica Editrice, n.d. Pp. xxxvi + 142. (Biblioteca di Lingue e Letterature Straniere, I).

Donne, John.—The Divine Poems. Ed. by Helen Gardner. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952. Pp. xcviii + 147. \$5.00.

Hammer, Carl, Jr.—Longfellow's "Golden Legend" and Goethe's "Faust." Baton Rouge, La.: Louisiana State Univ. Press, 1952. Pp. 35. \$5.00. (Louisiana State Univ. Studies, Humanities Series, 2.)

Harbage, Alfred.—Shakespeare and the Rival Traditions. New York: Macmillan, 1952. Pp. xviii + 393. \$6.00.

Nicoll, Allardyce.—Shakespeare: an Introduction. New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1952. Pp. 181. \$2.50.

Quinlan, Maurice J.—William Cowper, a Critical Life. Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press, 1953. Pp. xiii + 251. \$4.50.

Reade, Aleyn L.—Johnsonian Gleanings. Part XI (Consolidated Index of Persons). London: Privately printed, 1952. Pp. xii + 518.

Shenstone, William.—Shenstone's Miscellany, 1759-1763. Ed. from the MS. by Ian A. Gordon. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952. Pp. xx + 164. \$4.25.

Yamamoto, Tadao.—Growth and System of the Language of Dickens. Revised ed. Osaka, Japan: Kansai Univ. Press, 1952. Pp. 508 + 8 + 70.

GERMAN

Blauth, Henry & Roderbourg, Kurt.—Erzähl mir was! Boston: Ginn and Co., 1953. ix + 250 pp. \$3.25.

David, Claude.—Stefan George. Son œuvre poétique [Bibl. de la Société des études Germaniques, Vol. IX]. Lyon-Paris: I A C, 1952. 409 pp.

Grappin, Pierre.—Le Bund Neues Vaterland (1914-1916); ses rapports avec Romain Rolland [Bibl. de la société des études Germaniques, Vol. VII]. Lyon-Paris: I A C, 1952. 4 + 150 pp.

Gray, Ronald D.—Goethe the Alchemist. A study of alchemical Symbolism in Goethe's literary and scientific works. Cambridge: University Press, 1952. x + 312 pp. 3 plates. \$7.

Hagström, Sten.—Zur Inversion in deutschen Satzwörtern. [Uppsala Universitets Arsskrift 1952: 8]. Uppsala: Lundequistska Bokhandeln, 1952. 90 pp.

Reiss, H. S.—Franz Kafka. Betrachtung seines Werkes. Heidelberg: Lambert Schneider, 1952. 195 pp. DM. 12.50.

Scharfenberg, Albrecht von.—Der jüngere Titurel. Ausgewählt u. hrg. v. Werner Wolf. [Altdeutsche Übungstexte d. Akadem. Gesellschaft schweizer Germanisten. Vol. 14]. Bern: A. Francke, 1952. 80 pp. Sfr. 4.50.

Straumann-Windler, Hedwig.—Stifters Narren. Zum Problem der Spätromantik. Zürich: Juris-Verlag, 1952. 99 pp. sFr. 8.30.

FRENCH

Adams, G. C. S.—Words and Descriptive Terms for Woman and Girl in French and Provençal. Chapel Hill: U. of N. C., 1952. vii + 99 pp. \$1.50.

Baudelaire.—Petits poèmes en prose, le Spleen de Paris, éd. Daniel-Rops. Paris: Belles Lettres, 1952. xxxii + 229 pp. Fr. 500.

Bertaut, Jules.—La Vie privée de Chateaubriand. Paris: Hachette, 1952. 252 pp. Fr. 500.

Bibesco, M.-L.—Le voyageur voilé: Marcel Proust. Lettres au duc de Guiche et docs. inédits. Geneva: La Palatine, 1949. 121 pp. SFr. 7.50.

Cattaui, Georges.—Marcel Proust. Paris: Julliard, 1952. xvi + 288 pp. Fr. 900.

Daudet, Lucien.—Autour de soixante lettres de Marcel Proust. Paris: Gallimard, 1952. 243 pp. Fr. 420.

Debraye, Henry.—Stendhal. Docs. iconographiques. Geneva: Cailler, 1950. 228 pp. SFr. 10.

Dupont, Henry.—L'Amérique dans l'œuvre de Victor Hugo. New York: Cultural Division of the French Embassy, 1952. 36 pp.

Eigeldinger, Marc.—Le platonisme de Baudelaire. Neuchâtel: La Baconnière, 1952. 118 pp. SFr. 5.

Ernst, Fr. and S. N. Levy.—Le Français; conversation, grammaire, lecture. New York: Holt, 1952. xvi + 520 + xxxviii pp. \$3.56.

- Fouyé, Yves.**—Guy de Maupassant et les criminels. *Rouen*: Impr. Commerciale, 1952. 36 pp.
- Glauser, Alfred.**—Albert Thibaudet et la critique créatrice. *Paris*: Boivin, 1952. 296 pp. Fr. 800.
- Gougenheim, G.**—Grammaire de la langue française du XVI^e siècle. *Paris*: I. A. C., 1952. 258 pp. Fr. 1500.
- Gryting, L. A. T. (ed.).**—The Oldest Version of the Twelfth-Century Poem, *la Venjance Nostre Seigneur*. *Ann Arbor*: U. of Mich. Press, 1952. x + 143 pp. (U. of Mich. Contribs to Mod. Phil., no. 19.)
- Hasselrot, Bengt.**—Nouveaux Documents sur Benjamin Constant et Mme de Staël. *Copenhagen*: Munksgaard, 1952. 83 pp.
- Hugo, Victor.**—Les Orientales, éd. crit. par Elisabeth Barineau. *Paris*: Didier, 1952. xxxiv + 171 pp. (Soc. des t. fr. mod.)
- Jacobi, Hansres.**—Amphitryon in Frankreich und Deutschland. *Zürich*: Juris-Verlag, 1952. 135 pp. SFr. 10.40.
- Jarry, Alfred.**—Œuvres choisies, éd. J.-H. Levesque. *Paris*: Seghers, 1951. 221 pp. Fr. 390.
- Kohler, Pierre.**—Au Château de Coppet. Mme de Staël et ses amis. *Lausanne*: Spes, 1952. 37 pp. SFr. 3.25.
- Laforgue, Jules.**—Choix de poèmes, éd. M.-J. Durr. *Paris*: Seghers, 1952. 255 pp. Fr. 390.
- Lagrange, Andrée.**—L'Art de Fromentin. *Paris*: Dervy, 1952. 151 pp.
- Lindstrom, Thais S.**—Tolstoï en France (1886-1910). *Paris*: Inst. d'études slaves, 1952. 172 pp.
- Lotte, Fernand.**—Dictionnaire biographique des personnages fictifs de la Comédie humaine. *Paris*: Corti, 1952. xxxii + 687 pp. Fr. 2000.
- Mauriac.**—La Mort d'André Gide. *Paris*: Eds. Estienne, 1952. 46 pp.
- Michelet, Jules.**—La Sorcière, éd. Lucien Refort. T. I. *Paris*: Didier, 1952. lxxiv + 191 pp. (Soc. des t. fr. mod.)
- Nerval, Gérard de.**—Œuvres, éd. Albert Béguin et Jean Richer. *Paris*: Gallimard, 1952. 1392 pp. Fr. 2400.
- Parturier, Maurice.**—Une amitié littéraire. Mérimée et Tourguéniev. *Paris*: Hachette, 1952. 255 pp. Fr. 600.
- Reverdy, Pierre.**—Œuvres choisies, éd. Jean Rousselot et Michel Manoli. *Paris*: Seghers, 1951. 239 pp. Fr. 390.
- Rimbaud.**—Poésies, précédées de *Vues sur Rimbaud* par Duhamel. *Paris*: l'Artisan du livre, 1952. 253 pp. Fr. 3600.
- Saillet, Maurice.**—Saint-John Perse, poète de gloire. *Paris*: Mercure de France, 1952. 191 pp. Fr. 360.
- Severino, Agostino.**—Letteratura francese del Novecento. *Florence*: Valmartina, 1951. 265 pp. L. 1000.
- Starr, W. H. and Others.**—Functional French. *New York*: American Bk. Co., 1951. xviii + 292 pp. \$3.00.
- Tentori, M. A.**—Teorie e studi recenti sulla canzone popolare francese. *Rome*: Ed. dell' Ateneo, 1951. 87 pp. L. 350.
- Tortel, Jean.**—Le Préclassicisme français. *Paris*: Cahiers du Sud, 1951. 375 pp. Fr. 890.
- Travis, E. B. and J. E.**—Cours moyen de français, éd. F. C. A. Jeanneret. *New York*: Noble, 1951. 416 pp. \$2.25.
- Tzara, Tristan.**—Choix de textes, éd. René Lacôte. *Paris*: Seghers, 1952. 231 pp. Fr. 390.
- Vigny, Alfred de.**—Lettres d'un dernier amour, éd. V. L. Saulnier. *Geneva*: Droz, 1952. xvi + 158 pp.
- Zola par lui-même.** Textes présentés par Marc Bernard. *Paris*: Eds. du Seuil, 1952. 191 pp.

ITALIAN

- Alfieri, Vittorio.**—Agamemnon, ed. Daniele Mattalia. *Florence*: Vallecchi, 1952. 107 pp. L. 310.
- Tragedie. Ed. critica Carmine Jan-naco. Vol. I: Filippo. *Asti*: Casa d'Alfieri, 1952. lxxviii + 456 pp.
- Apollonio, Mario.**—Fondazioni della cultura ital. mod. Vol. II. *Florence*: Sansoni, 1952. 392 pp. L. 2500.
- Storia del teatro italiano. II. *Florence*: Sansoni, 1952. 416 pp. L. 3500.
- Ariosto.**—Orlando Furioso, ed. Salvatore Multineddu. *Bologna*: Zanichelli, 1952. xxviii + 458 pp. L. 1000.
- Barbi, Michele.**—Dante. Vita, opere e fortuna. *Florence*: Sansoni, 1952. 271 pp. L. 900.
- Bianchi, P. e B. Zanoli.**—Il primo dizionario della lingua ital. *Milan*: Vallardi, 1952. x + 807 pp.
- Biondillo, Fr.**—Carducci. *Mazara*: Ses, 1952. 118 pp. L. 600.
- Bulesa, La.**—Commedia cinquecentesca inedita a cura di Gildo Meneghetti. *Venice*: Zanetti, 1952. 79 pp.

Cappellani, Nino. — La sintassi narrativa dell' Ariosto. *Florence*: La nuova Italia, 1952. xiv + 98 pp. L. 400.

Carducci, G. — Lettere, Vol. XIV: 1882-4, ed. Manara Valgimigli. *Bologna*: Zanichelli, 1952. 351 pp.

Fasani, Remo. — Saggio sui "Promessi sposi." *Florence*: Le Monnier, 1952. iv + 195 pp.

Getto, Giovanni. — Il canto XVII dell' "Inferno." *Rome*: Signorelli, 1952. 32 pp. L. 200.

Iazzetta, Gianfranco. — Torquato Tasso. *Milan*: Gastaldi, 1952. 38 pp. L. 200.

Leonardo da Vinci. — Tutti gli scritti ed. Augusto Marinoni. Vol. I. *Milan*: Rizzoli, 1952. 263 pp. L. 180.

Leopardi. — Poesie, ed. M. Lepore. *Milan*: Ed. Viola, 1952. 833 pp.

Parini. — Poesie e prose, ed. L. Caretti. *Naples*: Ricciardi, 1952. viii + 962 pp. L. 5000.

Pasquali, Giorgio. — Vecchie e nuove pagine stravaganti di un filologo. *Florence*: De Silva, 1952. x + 319 pp. L. 1400.

Puppo, Mario. — Il romanticismo. *Rome*: Ed. Studium, 1952. 138 pp. L. 200.

Simoni, Renato. — Trent' anni di cronaca drammatica. Vol. I: 1911-23. *Turin*: Sei, 1952. xlviii + 774 pp.

SPANISH

Alemán, Mateo. — Ortografía castellana, ed. J. Rojas Gareidueñas. *Mexico*: El Colegio, 1950. xxxix + 124 pp.

Cueto y Mena, Juan de. — Obras, ed. Archer Woodford. Prólogo de J. M. Rivas Sacconi. *Bogotá*: Inst. Caro y Cuervo, 1952. xl + 315 pp.

Delicado, Fr. — La lozana andaluza (1528), ed. A. Pérez Gómez. *Valencia*: 1950. 60 folios.

Dunn, Peter N. — Castillo Solórzano. *Oxford*: Blackwell, 1952. xviii + 141 pp. 25 s.

Gorostiza. — Contigo pan y cebolla, ed. J. C. Babcock. *Boston*: Houghton Mifflin, 1953. vi + 109 pp. \$.90.

Iannuci, James E. — Lexical Number in Spanish Nouns with Reference to Their English Equivalents. *Philadelphia*: U. of Pa., 1952. xii + 80 pp.

Ibáñez Fernández, J. — Diccionario galego da rima e galego-castelan. *Marsiega*: Madrid, 1950. xxxvi + 219 pp.

Jarrett, E. M. and B. J. M. McManus. — El Camino real. Bk. I. Third ed. *Boston*: Houghton Mifflin, 1953. x + 579 pp. \$3.40.

Maregalli, Franco. — Gabriel Miró. *Milan*: Edit. Cisalpino di Varese, 1949. 70 pp.

Medina, J. R. — Cantas del Valle de Tenza. 3 v. *Bogotá*: Bibl. del Folklore Colombiano, 1949. 740 pp.

Miller, E. D. — La sociedad chilena coetánea como se ve a través de las principales novelas de Alberto Blest Gana. *Mexico*: Univ. Nac. Autónoma, 1949. 102 pp.

Miró, Rodrigo. — El cuento en Panamá. *Panamá*: Impr. de la Acad., 1950. 208 pp.

Pérez Galdós. — Crónica de la Quincena, ed. W. H. Shoemaker. *Princeton*: U. Press, 1948. xi + 140 pp.

Pérez Poiré, Margarita. — Don José López-Portillo y Rojas. *Mexico*: Univ. Nac. Autónoma, 1949. 196 pp.

Pesado, Mercedes. — Influencia de Juan Ramón Jiménez en el grupo de Contemporáneos. *Mexico*: 1949. 170 pp.

Ragucci, R. M. — Literatura medieval castellana. *Buenos Aires*: Soc. Edit. Internacional, 1949. xxix + 427 pp.

Rodríguez, M. B. (ed.). — Cuentistas de hoy. *Boston*: Houghton Mifflin, 1952. viii + 207 pp. \$1.80.

Rosenblat, Angel. — Argentina: historia de un nombre. *Buenos Aires*: Nova, 1949. 63 pp.

Salas Barbadillo. — El caballero perfecto, ed. Pauline Marshall. *Boulder*: U. of Colorado Press, 1949. li + 95 pp.

Sánchez, Alberto. — Poesía sevillana en la Edad de Oro. *Madrid*: Bibl. Clásica Cast., 1948. 497 pp.

Sanín Cano, B. — De mi vida y otras vidas. *Bogotá*: Edit. ABC, 1949. 254 pp.

Schürr, Friedrich. — Cervantes. *Essen*: Chamier, 1949. 173 pp.

Sierra, Justo. — Obras completas. Vols. II, III. *Mexico*: Univ. Nac. Autónoma, 1949. 1098 pp.

Tapia y Rivera, A. — Enardo and Rosael, tr. by A. Tapia, Jr., and Margot Lee. *New York*: Philosophical Library, 1952. xxii + 56 pp. \$2.75.

Vela, Arqueles. — Teoría literaria del modernismo. *Mexico*: Botas, 1949. 367 pp.

Viqueira Barreiro, J. M. — El lusitanismo de Lope de Vega y su comedia "El Brasil restituído." *Coimbra*: 1950. 425 pp.

Wartburg, W. von. — Die Ausgliederung der romanischen Sprachräume. *Bern*: Francke, 1950. x + 158 pp.

Wéyland, W. G. (ed.). — Poetas coloniales de la Argentina: antología. *Buenos Aires*: Angel Estrada, 1949. xxix + 172 pp.

Wozan, D. S. — A literatura hispano-americana no Brasil: 1877-1944. *Baton Rouge*: La. State U., 1948. 98 pp.

PORTUGUESE

Albuquerque, A. T. d'. — O nosso vocabulário. *Rio de Janeiro*: Getúlio Costa, 1949. 283 pp.

— Questões lingüísticas americanas. *Ibid.*: Aurora, 1949. 186 pp.

Alves, Joaquim. — Autores cearenses. *Fortaleza*: Clá, 1949. 146 pp.

Aurora, Conde d'. — Eça de Queiros mestre de portugalidade. *Oporto*: 1952.

Auto de Santo Aleixo de Baltazar, ed. André Grabbé Rocha. *Coimbra*: 1952. (Col. Universo, no. 19.)

Bruzzi, Nilo. — Casimiro de Abreu. *Rio de Janeiro*: Aurora, 1949. 203 pp.

Cabral, Alfredo. — ABC ortográfico. Regras da nova ortografia e registro das principais palavras cuja escrita possa oferecer dúvidas. *Lisbon*: 1952.

Carvalho, J. B. de. — As ideias políticas e sociais de Alex. Herculano. *Lisbon*: 1949. 232 pp.

Faria Artur, A. de. — Prontuário de palavras homófonas e homógrafas da língua portuguesa. *Lisbon*: 1952.

Guérios, R. F. M. — Dicionário etimológico de nomes e sobrenomes. *Curitiba*: Edit. do Brasil, 1949. 179 pp.

Menezes, R. de. — Escritores na intimidade. *São Paulo*: Martins, 1949. 326 pp.

Montenegro, T. H. — Tuberculose e literatura. *Rio de Janeiro*: Inst. Brasileiro de Geog., 1949. 220 pp.

Moraes, R. B. de e William Berrien (eds.). — Manual bibliográfico de estudos brasileiros. *Rio de Janeiro*: Edit. Souza, 1949. xii + 895 pp.

Nascentes, Antenor. — Dicionário básico do português do Brasil. *São Paulo*: Martins, 1949. 777 pp.

Reis, A. S. dos (ed.). — Narcisa Amália. *Rio de Janeiro*: Simões, 1949. 192 pp.

Saraina, A. J. — Herculano e o liberalismo em Portugal, 1834-50. *Lisbon*: 1949. 239 pp.

— História da cultura em Portugal. *Lisbon*: Jornal do Foro, 1950. 336 pp.

Silva, H. P. da. — A megalomania literária de Machado de Assis. *Rio de Janeiro*: Aurora, 1949. 127 pp.

Venâncio Filho, Francisco. — Euclides da Cunha. *Rio de Janeiro*: Inst. Brasileiro de Geog., 1949. 37 pp.

RUSSIAN

Duddington, Natalie. — Intermediate Russian Reader. *Boston*: Heath, n. d. [1952]. 172 pp. \$2.00.

Gorky. — Ilya's Childhood and Children, ed. G. A. Birkell. *New York*: Oxford, 1952. \$75.

Gumilyov. — The Unpublished Gumilyov. *New York*: Chekhov Publishing House, 1952. 238 pp.

Lo Gatto, Ettore. — Storia del teatro russo. Vol. I. *Florence*: Sansoni, 1952. xii + 629 pp.

Maurois, André. — Tourguéniev. *Paris*: Tallandier, 1952. 255 pp. Fr. 350.

Vasmer, Max. — Russisches etymologisches Wörterbuch. 7 Lieferung. *Heidelberg*: Winter, 1952. Pp. 465-544.

CZECH

Harkins, W. E. and Marie Hnyková. — A Modern Czech Grammar. *New York*: King's Crown Press, 1953. xii + 338 pp. \$4.50.

GENERAL

Astorg, Bertrand d'. — Aspects de la littérature européenne depuis 1945. *Paris*: Eds. du Seuil, 1952. 254 pp. Fr. 480.

Reid, Ed. — Mafia. *New York*: Random House, 1952. xii + 238 pp. \$3.00.

Rohlf, Gerhard. — An den Quellen der romanischen Sprachen. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1952. xii + 286 pp.

Shipley, J. T. (ed.). — Dictionary of World Literature. Revised ed. *New York*: Philosophical Library, 1953. xiv + 453 pp. \$6.00.

Thierbach, A. — Untersuchungen zur Benennung der Kirchenfeste in den romanischen Sprachen. *Berlin*: Akad. der Wiss., 1951. 134 pp.

Väänänen, Veikko. — "Il est venu comme ambassadeur," "il agit en soldat" et locutions analogues et latin, français, italien et espagnol. *Helsinki*: Annales Acad. Sc. Fennicae, 1951. 75 pp.

ral.

ria
ro:da
deus-
2].en,
52.ov.
se,so.
+

s:

es
g:c:
p.t-
s:

m

er
r,ld
o-

0.

ar
a-

b,

ne

i-

et

c.

E. M. W. Tillyard

AUTHOR OF

Studies in Milton

The Elizabethan World Picture

The Poetry of Sir Thomas Wyatt

NOW WRITES

THE ENGLISH RENAISSANCE:
FACT OR FICTION?

A noted English scholar here examines the Mediaeval and Renaissance traditions in an attempt to determine how great an upheaval, how marked a change, occurred in English literature during the transitional period. Setting forth certain differences in English habits of thought and artistic attitudes during the two epochs, Professor Tillyard tests and illustrates them in three widely separated areas of literature: the lyric, the epic, and literary criticism. \$3.00

The Johns Hopkins Press

Baltimore 18, Md.

—A practical course for the second year—

FLUENT FRENCH

by

Francois Denoeu

For all students who have had a basic course in French and wish to continue along conversational lines. This is the first complete French review grammar with a completely conversational approach. The grammatical structure is presented in full at the intermediate level. Drills and exercises are so designed as to promote maximum fluency in the use of the language. Your students will have fun with this book, but they will also learn to speak French!



D.C. HEATH

and Company

SALES OFFICES: NEW YORK CHICAGO SAN FRANCISCO ATLANTA DALLAS
HOME OFFICE: BOSTON



Perfect Your FRENCH

... in this natural French setting at

McGILL UNIVERSITY

FRENCH SUMMER SCHOOL

MONTREAL

JUNE 30 to AUGUST 11, 1952

Perfect your French, for professional use or for business or pleasure in natural, attractive French atmosphere at McGill's popular, long-established French Summer School at Montreal. Ideal study, conversational, residential course for teachers, students, and business people; also for advanced students of good intellectual ability who aim at graduate work in McGill. French alone spoken at all times in residence. Tuition is of unusually high standards by experienced French university teachers. Resident scholarships and university credit certificates. Co-educational. Luxurious accommodation in beautiful Douglas Hall, interesting social amenities, music and dramatics.

Fee (board, residence and tuition) \$285. (Canadian)
(Tuition only, \$125.)

Write Now for prospectus to: DIRECTOR, FRENCH SUMMER SCHOOL

McGILL UNIVERSITY, MONTREAL, CANADA